National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY, OLIVER JOHNSON, } ..... Editors.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor

VOL. XIV. NO. 32. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1853. WHOLE NO. 708.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street, New York.

THE STANDARD.

ANTI-SLAVERY AGITATION IN CONGRESS.

[In the United States House of Representatives, on Tuesday, Dec. 20th (the House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and Mr. Houston having offered resolutions to refer the several portions of the President's Message to appropriate Committees), Hon. GERRIT SMITH made his first Congressional Speech. Taking for his text the President's allusion to the case of Martin Koszta, he expressed his disapproval of some things in the action of the Government upon that case, and showed how the alliance of the President and his Cabinet with a worse than Austrian Despotism at home made it impossible that they should maintain to the full extent the rights of Fugitives from foreign oppression, and turned all their professions in that regard into an empty mockery! He spoke with great ability and impressiveness. As he is writing out the Speech himself, we omit the *Daily Globe's* report of it, but copy its sketch of the debate that followed.]

Mr. Preston's Reply to Mr. Smith.

Mr. PRESTON, of Kentucky. I have listened, Mr. Chairman, not without a certain degree of interest, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith], who has just addressed the committee, and I now desire its indulgence for a brief response, though nothing could have been further from my intentions than the design of offering any remarks to-day in relation to any subject that engages the legislative attention.

Living, as I do, in a State recognising Slavery, and firmly convinced, as I am, of the propriety of protecting our property in slaves, yet I do not desire to reply in any intolerant spirit to the views which have been advanced by the gentleman from New York. I feel conscious that the great and wise men who ushered our government into existence, and laid its foundations deep in truth and justice, were not inferior in religion or philanthropy to those who assail the rights of the Southern members of the Confederacy, assail their institutions, and decry their people. And although I may feel, with a strength of conviction that my language cannot adequately express, the injustice of assailing those rights, yet it is far from me to desire to evade or strangle discussion by denunciation or violence. I trust to the power of truth to show that the men of the South are not the representatives of a people enduring the odious tyranny that the gentleman asserts; that they are not men tolerating and fostering a wrong against every dictate of humanity and justice, but entertaining far wiser and more practical views than those misguided enthusiasts who would shake to its centre a Government planned by patriots and statesmen and cemented by the public prosperity.

Enthusiasm, sir, is respectable even in error. It is attractive when clothed in the fullness of appropriate language, and marked by eloquent delivery; but this should not blind us to the pernicious sentiments contained in the remarks we have heard. The gentleman from New York has sought to institute a parallel between the principles of Abolition and those contained in the letter of the Secretary of State to the Chevalier Hulsemann in relation to the surrender of Martin Koszta. To institute a comparison which would unite principles so dissimilar, would be to create a monster in the political world more deformed than the Siamese twins in the physical world.

The sum of the doctrine in the Koszta letter, as asserted by the American Secretary, is, that Martin Koszta, having taken the initiatory steps to become a citizen in the United States, and having filed his declaration of intention in our courts, became clothed with such a nationality that, having gone into the city of Smyrna, in the peaceful pursuit of business or of pleasure, that he was still under the protecting power of the American flag, and beyond recapture by the power of Austria. But, let me ask the gentleman, if a treaty had existed between Austria and the Government of the United States, by which the solemn faith of the American Government were pledged to restore such refugees, as we stipulate for the extradition of felons with Great Britain under the Ashburton treaty, whether, without a violation of faith, we could have refused to surrender the fugitive? There can be but one solution to the question. Yet, have not the States of the American Union something more solemn and more obligatory than a mere treaty to compel the extradition of fugitive slaves; something more than a compact, as Webster expounded it, in his memorable reply to Hayne; something more solemn and more binding than treaty or compact—the very Constitution itself upon which our Government exists? A sovereign can recede from a treaty or a compact, and no tribunal on earth but itself can judge it; but in our Constitution—the most solemn form of obligation that society knows—a tribunal, the Supreme Court, is established to assist in the enforcement of the rights of the people composing the Confederacy. This Constitution, solemnly ratified, guaranties to the slaveholding States the protection of their property, and the extradition of fugitive slaves, when they escape into sister States where the institution is not recognised. Shall those solemn promises be fulfilled? or shall the pseudo-philanthropist, with the Bible in his hand—the Bible upon which the founders of our Government, and the two hundred and thirty-eight gentlemen here assembled, were sworn to support the Constitution—invoke our body to disregard its precepts, and commit meditated perjury by violating its provisions? Yet, such is the morality that fanatical enthusiasm proposes.

The logic of the Secretary of State has been assailed, upon the ground that he has chosen to place an unwarranted limitation upon the divine injunction that you should "do unto others as you would they should do unto you;" yet I would ask of the gentleman who has so keenly criticised the expression, if it is not a plain matter to an unsophisticated mind that we should fulfil the promises that we make to others? and if, under this principle, the people of the North are not morally bound to fulfil their promises to their Southern brethren?

[After some farther remarks upon the case of Koszta, and the laws relating to it, the speaker proceeded.]

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Chairman, has not only criticised the letter of the Secretary, but has chosen to make this the occasion for a general denunciation of the institution of Slavery in the Southern States. I know, sir, that the subject is trite and exhausted, but I feel unwilling that the remarks which he has uttered should pass without some reply.

The Southern States, since their earliest colonial history, have been peopled by two races of different colour and of different civilization. We hold them in bondage because we are unwilling to amalgamate with them, and desire to keep our Teutonic blood pure and uncorrupted by any baser admixture; because we prefer that their untutored labour should be directed by the superior intelligence of our race to useful industry, rather than that they should be freed from all wholesome restraint, and left without coercion to pollute our blood and destroy our progress. It is not within our comprehension to divine the cause which has made the Ruler of Nations establish this order of things.

The wisdom of man cannot foresee or penetrate the means by which the civilization of nations is directed by Him. We see ourselves surrounded by three millions of the African race, who, under the dominion of the white race, has, in two hundred years made greater advances in religion and civilization than they have made in four thousand years in their aboriginal condition. If, at this hour, the angel of death were to breathe upon the face of our people, as it did upon the hosts of Senacherib, the surviving black race would exhibit a picture of civilization more remarkable than any that Africa has ever exhibited. But the African is not the only race which has been subject to Slavery. Eight hundred years since our boasted Saxons endured a Slavery as abject as that of the Southern negro. The history of all savage races who have attained the blessings of civilization shows that they have marched to freedom through the portals of Slavery. Where two races of widely different civilization exist together, the superior exterminate or enslave the inferior. The indocility of the Indian will cause him to be swept from the face of the earth. Slavery seems to be the price that ignorance pays to intelligence for its tuition in the arts of civilization.

Nothing can be more disastrous to a State than the premature enfranchisement of an enslaved race. They gangrene upon the face of its society, until it perishes under the affliction. It is a singular historical fact, and worthy of note, that the first Abolitionist was the first person who introduced African Slavery upon the shores of America. Las Casas, the Bishop of Chiapas, after Cortez conquered Mexico, felt the deepest compassion for the Indians who were alloted as slaves to his Spanish adventurers. He petitioned the King of Spain that these Indian slaves should be enfranchised, and that the more robust and hardy negroes of the African coast should be imported. His prayer was granted, and it is to him the thraldom of the African in America is to be first attributed. The misfortunes of Mexico at this hour are, in my opinion, attributable, in a great measure, to the indiscreet philanthropy of Las Casas. The barriers which separated the races were cast down, the Castillian blood no longer ran pure and unpolluted in the veins of the people. The great preponderating Mestizo, or mixed race, was engendered; and he who will walk through the streets of Mexico will see all the horrid results of a debased amalgamated race, as he sees the Mexican of pure Spanish descent spurn from him with his foot, as he would some beast, the loathy Mestizo that obstructs the way.

But let me turn for a moment from a consideration of this picture, and ask if our forefathers had framed the wise and beneficent government we enjoy; if to-morrow the Ohio were the military line of demarcation between the North and South, as the Rhine between Germany and France; if forts were erected, custom-houses established, and armies posted; if union were proposed to remedy all these evils, would it be accepted? If we were assembled as delegates, and the South were to demand the same terms our Constitution guarantees, and the regulation of our own domestic institutions, can we for a moment doubt that, after all the benefits we have experienced, the North would not be willing and anxious to accede to its provisions? Or would we of the South, forgetful of the gallant spirit of our forefathers who planted the Southern colonies, and whose descendants, surmounting the crests of the Alleghanies, bore civilization and religion into the primeval forests of the West, until they were borne over in Kentucky and Missouri, even to the golden shores of California, prove recreant to the glorious memories of the past, and submit to dishonourable dictation?

I respect the generosity of emotion that seems to move the gentleman from New York, decisively as I differ from every sentiment he utters; but I must say, that the Abolition of African Slavery and its agitation are fraught only with the most pernicious consequences to our common country. I live in a State in which the institution of Slavery exists, in which we have stood by our Southern brethren, and will stand by them in the defence of our rights; and that if Slavery be not perpetual, the hand of time will do more for the cause than the misdirected efforts of philanthropy or fanaticism. We may aptly say, when we point to the ameliorations wrought already by time in the condition of our slaves,

"Turne, quod optanti Divum promittere nemo
Auderet, volvenda dies en attulit ultro."

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this subject may no longer be the subject of agitation; for I feel assured that, if it is continued, it will overwhelm the institutions we have inherited from our wise and patriotic ancestors in irretrievable ruin.

Mr. Dean in Reply to Mr. Smith.

DECEMBER 21, 1853.

Mr. DEAN, of New York, addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Chairman, having at an early day in the session given notice of my intention to offer some resolutions in reference to the conduct of Captain Ingraham, and having yesterday offered those resolutions, I stated at the time of offering them that I supposed they would give rise to no debate. I myself did not desire to debate them, and they were referred to a committee without debate. But almost immediately after this occurrence, a colleague of mine [Mr. SMITH] commenced a debate upon the President's message, and referred directly to Captain Ingraham's conduct, and referred to it in a party aspect. Sir, I regret this deeply. I regret that, upon a question of this kind—a question which has no party affinities—on a subject having reference to the conduct of an officer of our Navy, in relation to whom, I presume, not a man in the House knows to which party he belongs—I say I regret deeply that, upon a subject of this kind, any attempt should be made to connect it with party. For, sir, I undertake to say, that the American people—the will of the entire American people—has been represented by the conduct of the Government; and I say here now, although we may be divided upon some questions; although, in the dispensation of offices, party lines must be observed to some extent, yet the President is the representative of the whole people, and not the representative of any party; and in this act, which has challenged the attention of all men of all parties, and, indeed, of the whole world, more than any other single occurrence of the last quarter of a century, the conduct of our Government, in sustaining its officers, has met the universal approval of every party in this country, and all classes of men throughout the world; and that the question which lies at the bottom involves a principle which should not be brought into the arena of party politics; and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PRESTON] for so gallantly coming forward and defending the conduct of Captain Ingraham and our Government in this affair.

Sir, I come not here to defend the Administration. I have nothing to do with that question now, and utterly disclaim any such motive; but I cannot permit a remark or two which my colleague from the Madison district [Mr. Smith] made, yesterday, in reference to our Government, to pass unnoticed. The gentleman told this committee, and through the committee has published it to the world, that although Austria is a despotism, yet this Government is a greater and a guiltier oppressor than even Austria—that the American Government, of which he forms a part, is a guiltier oppressor than Austria, and that this Administration owes its very being and existence to the slave power, and to the fact that it had been pledged in advance to that power.

Sir, upon that subject I shall avoid saying anything, except that this Administration, instead of being pledged to the slave power, or to any other power, is pledged only to those great principles which have been cherished and adopted by a vast majority of the American people—principles in reference to the action of the Federal Government on the subject of Slavery in the States that have been understood for years, and affirmed and reaffirmed in every national convention, for the last twelve years at any rate. They have adopted the doctrine that this Government was a confederacy of independent States formed for definite and specified purposes; that the powers of Congress are limited by the Constitution which created Congress; that the institution of Slavery in the States is a local institution, existing by virtue of municipal laws over which Congress has no control; that it existed at the time of the adoption of the Constitution; that, such being the case, Congress had nothing to do in its creation, or with its existence in any of the States of this Union.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Will the gentleman allow me a single moment to explain?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield the floor to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. DEAN. I must decline to do so. These interruptions are very inconvenient.

My colleague [Mr. Smith] said, yesterday, that this Government was a more guilty oppressor than Austria; and, by way of illustrating the position that he took, he made use of a very strong simile, which I shall not here repeat. Mr. Chairman, were it not for the well-known intelligence of that gentleman—were it not that he is known, not only throughout New York, but throughout the whole United States, as a man not only of enlightened philanthropy and entire sincerity—as a gentleman, and also as a scholar possessing the very highest intelligence—I should be inclined to impute to him ignorance of the subject on which he spoke, to imagine that he could not have known the system of government which prevails in Austria, or he never would have made such an assertion. He could not have known that in Austria the will of one man is law. He could not have known that the present Emperor, Francis Joseph, has wrested from the people a constitution which they compelled him to give them, only four or five years ago, and that now the police are authorised to arrest, without warrant, and imprison, any three men in Austria who may be found standing together. He could not have known that, to-day, *women*—women of the highest rank, women of education, women of the purest character; aye, *Christian* women—are pining in the dungeons of Austria, merely for political offences. The gentleman certainly must have forgotten, in his zeal, the celebrated proclamation of Haynau, a portion of which I beg leave to read. It is the proclamation of July, 1849, and was addressed to the Hungarians who were then engaged in a revolution, which excited the warmest sympathy, not only of American people, but of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Haynau, in addressing them on that occasion, said:

"Although the greater majority of you are Germans by language and by habit, yet, led on by a rascally hero of words, you have participated in the chimerical project of forming a Republic." * * * * "But I conform to the magnanimity of my Emperor and master. Hearken, however, to the voice of an old soldier who has shown how he keeps his word. Death will be visited, *without regard to condition or sex*, without delay, and on the spot where the deed is committed, upon every one: 1. Who attempts to assist the cause of the rebels, by word or deed, or by wearing revolutionary emblems. 2. Who dares to insult, by word or deed, one of my soldiers, or one of the soldiers of my brave allies. 3. Who enters into treasonable connections with the enemies of the Crown, and who attempts to kindle the spark of rebellion by malignant reports. 4. Who dares to secrete arms—as was, unfortunately, formerly the case—and does not deliver them during the space of time appointed by another proclamation of mine."

That proclamation, sir, ordered the death of every Hungarian who set up for a republican form of government, without regard to age or sex; and that proclamation did not proceed from Haynau; it was authorized by the Emperor of that country than which ours is said to be guiltier. But, sir, we need not go back to 1849. We have only to look at the position of Austria to-day in the struggle now going on between Turkey and Russia, which is a struggle for existence on the part of one of the acknowledged European nations. Austria, true to its instincts of despotism, refuses to allow the telegraph to be used for the purpose of transmitting intelligence of Turkish victories; liberty of the press does not exist there; and nobody is allowed to publish anything unless it is in favour of the government, and approved by its appointed censors. I say, therefore, that I must differ from my colleague when he attempts to institute a comparison between our Government and that, which is favourable to the latter. But, sir, I shall dismiss that subject—it has no relevancy to the conduct of Captain Ingraham, or of our Government in sustaining him.

I desire now to call the attention of the committee for a few minutes to the reasons which influenced me in introducing the resolutions in relation to Captain Ingraham. They will probably come up for action in the House in a few days, and, as is often the case, there may then be no opportunity of debating them at all. I therefore ask the attention of the committee to the subject now.

The object of introducing these resolutions and passing them here is not for the purpose merely of glorifying Captain Ingraham, nor yet for the purpose of bestowing praise or casting censure upon this Administration; but it is simply as an act of justice to a man who, alone, thousands of miles from his country, has dared to be brave, prudent, and resolute; and who, in the assertion of a great principle, has been victorious without the shedding of blood; and who, by his conduct, has maintained the great principle of American law, the right of expatriation, the right of every man to select his own place of residence, no matter where he may have been born. It is for another purpose—it is to show the world that American citizenship is worth possessing. Pass these resolutions, and you say to our people engaged in commerce, and travelling in whatever country, that wherever American enterprise may lead them, there American valour will defend; and that there is no one entitled to the protection of our Government, no matter how insignificant, but its whole power, if need be, will be brought to his aid. And, sir, whether Koszta was a citizen, and entitled to protection as a citizen, or whether he was a mere stranger and sojourner, it matters not; he had a paper which led Captain Ingraham to believe he was a proper subject for the exercise of power; it was exercised, and he was rescued; the principle was established, even if the person had no right to claim its exercise in his case. But we are told that he should not be protected because he was not a citizen, that he had only declared his intention to become such. I submit that citizenship has nothing to do with the case. The question is whether, when a man is entitled to the protection of the American flag by having resided in this country, and obtained a domicile here, or having declared his intention to become a citizen of these States, or by passport, or in any other way has placed himself in the situation of a subject, whether our brave naval officers are not to be sustained in affording it, even though they may be compelled to do it at the cannon's mouth. We have voted swords to Generals Scott and Taylor, and to other officers of our army, and unanimously. We are now called upon, and, in concert with the President, who has sustained Captain Ingraham, and the Secretary of the Navy—we being a co-ordinate and independent branch of the Government, the war-making power—to uphold the great principle involved. It is our duty to do so by some plain and explicit declaration, and I know of no more appropriate and emphatic manner of doing it than by adopting the resolutions that have been proposed.

Now, sir, I shall not go into any argument to justify Captain Ingraham. That has been done already by abler hands than mine. If any arguments were needed to sustain his conduct, gentlemen can find them by reference to that world-renowned correspondence. If any precedents be needed, they are cited there; but no precedents, no arguments could make this case plainer. God made each of us a man before He made him a citizen; and one has only to refer to the heart that is within him to justify the act at Smyrna.

I shall detain the committee no longer, Mr. Chairman. I trust that whenever this matter comes before the House it will be promptly acted on, and that the resolutions will be unanimously passed, and go forth to the world to show that the American Congress is willing to sustain American officers in the defence of American rights, and the protection of American citizens, both native and adopted.

Speech of Mr. Giddings—Doctrine of the Free Democracy—the Amistad Case.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Until within the last five minutes I had no expectation of addressing the committee to-day, and I therefore come before you unprepared. I should not now have intruded myself upon the attention of the committee, except for some remarks which have just fallen from the gentleman opposite [Mr. Dean]. It is due to myself, sir, it is due to this body, and to the country, that the imputation which he has thrown out in regard to his colleague [Mr. Smith, of New York], and those who act with him, should be promptly met and exposed upon this floor. Nothing else, sir, would have drawn me from my seat. But when I hear a gentleman, either from deliberate intention or from misapprehension, misrepresent honourable gentlemen upon this floor, it is due to such gentlemen that they should be set right.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have but one word in reply to the member who has just taken his seat before I proceed to some other remarks, which I had intended for a future occasion. When the gentleman here represents that this Confederacy was a Confederacy of States, and that this body possesses no jurisdiction which has not been specifically delegated to it, he and I agree. It is the State-Right doctrine, in behalf of which, for seventeen years, I have contended; and when he says that this body has no right to interfere with Slavery, he and I stand together, where we both stood in 1840 [laughter].

Now I desire, in this place, before the country, to meet the imputation which he has thrown out here, that his colleague [Mr. Smith], and those who associate with his colleague, have called upon this Government to interfere with Slavery. Our position is directly and unqualifiedly the opposite of that doctrine. We have been claiming that this Government should wash its hands of Slavery; that it should purify itself from its contaminations, and leave it with the States, where the Constitution left it. We demand that it shall cease to interfere with it.

And, now, in justice to that gentleman [Mr. Dean], and in order that he may set himself right, I call upon him to stand up here and tell this committee of an instance in which any man here—I mean of the Free Democracy—has called upon this Government to interfere with Slavery. He has represented us as doing that, and I call upon him now to back his imputation, to meet it like a man, before this body, and before the nation; or else shrink from his position and dodge it. And now, sir, I await the chivalry of that gentleman.

[Cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Mr. GIDDINGS (resuming). No, sir; I say to that gentleman, and to this House, that the day has arrived when we have the public ear, and the people of this nation are no longer to be deceived and misled. A hundred and fifty presses will bear to the whole North this exposure of his misrepresentation; that we are trying to interfere with Slavery in the States, or where it constitutionally exists. When that gentleman, upon this floor, deliberately votes to silence all agitation of this subject, and maintains a commerce in the bodies of women in this District, refuses to repeal our own laws by which women are bred in this city and sold in market—when he upholds the commerce by which the bodies of women are sold here to supply the "hells" of New Orleans—when that gentleman, with such guilt and crime resting upon him, says that Congress has nothing to do with Slavery—that the Government which authorizes this execrable commerce, and is now sustaining it with every influence it can put forth—he either over-estimates his own influence or the credulity of the people. This slave trade here, and on the high seas, is sustained by unconstitutional laws of Congress, which we say shall be repealed, but which he and his friends say shall be maintained. This is the issue between us. They are for continuing this interference; we say it shall cease.

He declares that we have no right to interfere. We never had such right. We have interfered, however, and have established this accursed slave trade; this commerce in the bodies of women; and that gentleman says, by his conduct, by his vote, by his political influence, that it shall continue; and he stands before this House and the country as the advocate and protector of it. Now, I understand my friend from New York [Mr. Smith], who spoke yesterday, to have laid down distinctly that this Federal Government had established this commerce in human flesh here; that they sold men, women, and children; and that if we only repealed our own laws the infamous traffic must cease; and I can only say to the gentleman over the way [Mr. Dean] that he exhibited that chivalry, in evading these points, which Falstaff possessed when he said that "discretion was the better part of valour." The gentleman shrinks from such discussion; and now let me say, in all kindness to him, as well as other gentlemen here, that you cannot deceive this country longer. You must meet these questions as they are; and if you retain the slave trade here by Congressional enactment, and oppose the repeal of such laws, the people of the whole North will repudiate that traffic; and let me go a little farther, and say, they will repudiate those who sustain it. Talk to us of the severity of the Austrian Government, in the imprisonment of intelligent women. Sir, in yonder slave-pen intelligent women are not only imprisoned, but they are sold like swine in market; and this is done by force of Congressional enactment. Such barbarity—such heathenism—was never practised by Austrian despotism. In order that I may be perfectly understood, I will repeat: we, the friends of freedom, are striving to purify this Government from such crimes. We desire to leave the question of Slavery and the slave trade with the States themselves. I assume that this Government has not the constitutional right nor the legitimate power to involve me and the people I represent in the disgrace of this traffic in slaves; and that we have a right, under the Federal Constitution, to be freed, exempted and purified from that accursed commerce. And, by all that is just and pure, we will free ourselves from such guilt.

The time is approaching, and it is not far distant, when we shall be relieved from this curse. The popular sentiment is advancing with an irresistible force, and I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dean], and those who take similar ground with him, that they must get out of the way, or the car of freedom will crush them in its onward course. This is the point upon which the whole issue between the advocates of liberty and the supporters of oppression rests. We of the North say that we will maintain the Government upon the doctrines for which it was founded. The eloquent gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Preston] said, yesterday, we must recur to the foundations of immutable and unchangeable truths, upon which this Government was founded, and which declare "*that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator* (not by man) *with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*" The man who would overthrow these sublime truths has no lot or part in a free Government—his sentiments are opposed to American freedom, and he is an enemy to the institutions under which we live, for he seeks to overthrow the very foundations upon which freedom is based, and upon which the Federal Government was erected.

I have no soft words upon this question, I say, then, that the man who would involve the people of New York or Ohio in this infamous traffic in human flesh is himself an enemy to the human race. He himself dishonours his State and dishonours his race. He himself violates the principles which Jefferson, and Hancock, and Adams, and their associates, proclaimed, to wit: that this Government—not the Southern States, with their Slavery—but that this Government was "constituted for the maintenance of freedom," and not Slavery; and he who would prostitute it to purposes of oppression is an enemy of mankind and of God. I say, then, that here stands the issue between the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dean] and his colleague [Mr. Smith]. We stand where Jefferson and the founders of the Republic stood. There we shall stand, and we "shall fight on and fight ever," until the people of the free States shall be redeemed and regenerated from the contagion of Slavery.

But, sir, I did not rise with the intention of spending as much time as I have upon this point. It was my design, at some future period, to address the committee upon another subject. I allude to the case of the Amistad, and it is my intention to call their attention for a few moments to that subject. In the annual message of the President, now under examination, he has seen fit to recommend to our favourable consideration the proposition to appropriate our national funds to indemnify the slave-dealers for the loss of their contemplated profits in their piratical pursuits.

Mr. BAYLY. The gentleman is correct; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs will report a bill for that purpose.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I understand the gentleman that he will report a bill for that purpose. I thank him for his generous, open-hearted avowal of such intention. I can always look to slaveholders with confidence for a frank and manly avowal of their purposes. I do no more than justice to them when I yield them this credit, and for this I would pay to them my humble tribute of respect, and not to the dough-faces of the North, who never come out with a bold, manly acknowledgment of their intentions, but who have to be kicked into sight before they will show themselves to the world [laughter].

Mr. Chairman, this proposition of the President is important. It is one which involves the sanctity of our treaty stipulations, for the support of which not only the faith of the Government, but that of the people of the United States, is pledged.

I now desire the attention of the committee for a few moments to some of the leading points in the history of the Amistad. Most gentlemen present may be familiar with them; but there are many new members of the House who may not be familiar with the arguments used in connection with this claim.

In 1817, the Government of Spain, by its treaty stipulations with the Government of Great Britain, pledged itself, its power, and influence, for the abolition of the slave trade. By that treaty Spain not only pledged herself to abolish the slave trade in her dominions and throughout her colonial dependencies, but she declared that all persons imported from Africa should be free on entering her dominions, or on entering her colonial possessions. We, sir, of this nation, stood under somewhat different circumstances. From the very foundation of the Government, the popular sentiment of the country was in opposition to the continuance of the slave trade.

In 1815, we bound ourselves, by solemn treaty with Great Britain, to use our power and influence for the total eradication of this traffic, and by subsequent treaties we ratified and repeated our pledge to carry out this undertaking, and for many years we have maintained a naval force upon the African coast, at an expense of from two to three million dollars annually, to carry out the design of ridding mankind from this disgraceful traffic.

By our legislation we have declared it piracy, and we hang the man that proves so recreant to his duties to his fellow-men as to be found engaged in that hated commerce. France had taken upon herself similar stipulations, and the whole civilized world stood pledged for the maintenance of the rights of humanity against this trade in men, which even Jefferson termed "an *execrable* traffic in human flesh."

Under these circumstances, in 1839 some Spanish slave-dealers, who were guilty of this piracy, prohibited by the laws of Spain as well as by treaty stipulations, imported into Havana a cargo of Africans. And here let me say that dates become material. This cargo of Africans were landed at Havana on the 12th of June, 1839, and placed in the barracoons of that city. On the 23d of the same month, Ruiz obtained from the Governor-General a permit to carry these *ladinoes*, or legal slaves, from Havana to Principe, which lies on the south side of the Island of Cuba, and, on the 24th, Montez obtained a like permit to carry forty-nine *ladinoes*, or legal slaves, to the same port. All that the slave-dealer had to do was to pay a stipulated duty to the Government, and to take his permit; and this committee will see that it was a permit to carry *lawful slaves*, and not imported Africans, who were free by the laws of Spain. It had no allusion to them; and I would respectfully call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who is going to report a bill, to these facts. It will be borne in mind that Montez and Ruiz purchased these Africans, knowing them to have been imported in violation of the Spanish treaty and of Spanish laws, and therefore *free*.

On the 28th of June, having been just sixteen days in the barracoons of Havana, they were shipped on board the Amistad, and on the 1st of July, while sailing along the eastern coast of Cuba, they came in sight, took possession of the vessel, and asserted their right to freedom. The captain and cook, who opposed them, were slain; the other sailors were sent ashore in a small boat. Montez was retained on board, and directed to guide the vessel to Africa; but, notwithstanding the compass, they directed their course to the north during the night and in cloudy weather, until they finally came to anchor near Montauk point, at the eastern end of Long Island. Now, I desire the attention of the Chairman of this committee, who is going to report the bill we have heard about, to know that on the 29th of August, 1839, these same men, Ruiz and Montez, filed in the district court of the State of Connecticut their demand for these slaves; that on the 19th of September these Africans filed their answers to this claim, denying that they ever had been slaves to Montez and Ruiz, or to any other person; they declared that they had been imported into Cuba in violation of Spanish laws and treaties, and were entitled to their freedom.

And I here call the attention of the committee more particularly to the fact that, at this period, when these poor Africans were strangers in a strange land, destitute of friends, ignorant of our language, the Government of the United States sent directions to its district attorney for the State of Connecticut to file a claim to their bodies in the United States district court, in order that they should be delivered over to the Cuban authorities, to be garroted for asserting their liberty. The executive influence was put forth in favour of oppression and the slave trade, instead of freedom. The district attorney obeyed his instructions, and lent the whole influence of his learning and talents to the cause of the slave trade. The whole case was litigated. The proofs were taken and the case was fully heard and deliberately considered, and the decree was entered declaring that they had been imported into Cuba in violation of the laws and treaties of Spain; that they were not, and never had been, slaves, but freemen; and instead of being given over to slavery, they were ordered to be set at liberty.

An appeal was taken from this decision to the circuit court of the United States, and the circuit re-affirmed the decree of the district court. An appeal was then taken to the United States Supreme Court, sitting in this Capitol, and the case was argued in this highest judicial tribunal of the nation, by the Attorney-General of the United States, and, upon full deliberation, the decree of the courts below was re-affirmed in all respects.

I will now show to this committee under what circumstances we are called upon to make an appropriation of funds collected from the freemen of the North. Sir, the whole power and influence of the government has contended for this claim before the judicial branch of Government; they have fully investigated, considered, and passed upon it. And it now comes up to us by way of appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court. The gentleman from Virginia seeks to overturn, overthrow, and reverse the decisions of all the courts of the United States. Then, sir, it was brought to this House; and I come now to another point which is somewhat important. In 1845, I think, we passed our ordinary appropriation bill for the civil and diplomatic expenses of Government; we sent it to the Senate and they inserted in it an amendment making an appropriation of $50,000 to pay these Spanish pirates for their loss of human flesh, by not being able to carry out their speculations against the treaties and laws of their Government against the rights of man and laws of God. It came before this body on that amendment; it was argued here by that venerated friend of his country and of mankind, from Massachusetts [Mr. Adams], who yet lingered upon the confines of time. He was pale and trembling with the weight of four-score years. His voice was feeble, and he had ceased to mingle in the debates of this body. He was acquainted with this cause in all its details; and when it was brought up for discussion in the Committee of the Whole, he rose to address the committee upon this proposed appropriation. Gentlemen came from all parts of the hall and crowded near him, and around him, to catch the last accents of that venerable and dying statesman; and I glory in the fact that those accents of denunciation were against the African slave trade, and against those who participated in it—against this claim, and against the recommendation of the President. It was his last, his dying speech, for he never spoke in this body afterwards. And, sir, of Democrats and Whigs, not five members who had listened to him had the hardihood to vote for the amendment of the Senate—not five men, I believe. I do not know, sir, that a single voice was raised in favour of it. I will not pronounce it infamous. No, sir, my friend from Virginia says he is going to report in favour of it, and I know that he would not do anything that he does not regard as honourable, however much mistaken he might be. And yet, sir, here, after the lapse of fourteen years—yes, sir, after a lapse of fourteen years from the time when these people were imported—when two-thirds of the seats of this House are filled by men who have never served here before, and probably not a dozen who have ever participated in the examination of this claim, it is again urged upon us. And why so? The President says, "the obligation is believed to be imposed on us by treaty stipulation."

And now I want to bespeak a kindness from my friend, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and it is this: that when he urges this claim upon the ground of treaty stipulation, he will be so kind as to tell us the treaty, the section, and the clause on which he bases our liability.

Mr. BAYLY, of Virginia. I shall be very apt to do it.

Mr. GIDDINGS. A former Committee on Foreign Affairs said that it was in the eighth, ninth, or tenth article—they did not know exactly which—of the treaty of 1795. The courts said it was not in either of them. Now, what I ask of my friend is, to tell us the specific clause on which he bases the right of these Spanish slave-dealers to the money of my constituents.

Why, sir, if the President and Senate had made a thousand treaties that we should pay the Spanish slave dealers for all the losses they may sustain in pursuing their occupation, is there a member of this body so lost to his own duty, to his self-respect, as to vote a dollar of the people's money for such purpose? Why, sir, the President and Senate may make such treaties as they please, if they can carry them out, all right; we cannot interfere. But if they call on us, the Representatives of the people, to pay money for their treaties, they must send us such a treaty as does not shock the conscience of civilized man. We would not be particular in regard to subjects of policy; but we would make no appropriation to maintain a piracy, if the Senate should send us such a treaty. But, fortunately, they have made no treaty committing us to the support of this Spanish slave trade.

Mr. Chairman, I have no time to read extracts. The President says that this claim has been reported on by both Houses of Congress. Now, I desire to call the attention of the committee and of the country to the fact, that when this claim came before the Senate they made merely a verbal report; but so far as my knowledge extends they never put pen to paper with regard to it, and I cannot be mistaken on this point. When a provincial judge once consulted Lord Mansfield in regard to his duty, he was advised always to tell *what* his opinion was, but to be careful never to assign *reasons* for it.

So it was with the Senate. They said that $50,000 ought to be allowed to pay these Spanish pirates; but they dared not put pen to paper to assign reasons why it should be done. They were too wary for that. I ask my friend from Virginia [Mr. Bayly] to be a little more gallant than they were, and to assign to us the reasons on which he wishes us to act. In this House a written report was made; and here I ask the attention of the gentlemen from the State of Pennsylvania, and from the city of Philadelphia in particular. I speak in no unkindness. If I entertain ill will towards any human being on earth, God forgive me! but the truth is due to all men, and we are bound to speak it. I say, then, that on the very first page of that report, in the second paragraph, there is a most palpable, obvious misrepresentation. I will not go further, and say that it was an intentional and deliberate misrepresentation of facts—that it was a premeditated falsehood. I leave every man who reads the report to pass his own judgment upon it. For my own part, I can regard it in no other light.

Mr. FLORENCE (interrupting). I understand that the gentleman has referred to me, and desires some information that he supposes I can furnish him.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I refer to any man or being who wishes to contradict what I say, in Heaven or on earth, or under the earth. I say that there is a most palpable, flagrant misrepresentation, a flagrant falsehood, upon the very first page of that report, and I will now proceed to explain what it is.

Mr. FLORENCE (again interrupting). I understood that the gentleman referred to some public capacity in which I was engaged, or to the pages of some report——

Mr. GIDDINGS. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FLORENCE. I only wished the gentleman to state what it was, that I might have an opportunity of giving him the information which I suppose he desired.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I thank the gentleman, but I made no allusion to him. I am referring to facts which are on record upon the archives of the country. This misrepresentation will remain upon the record through all coming time, and I stand here to vindicate the truth of history.

I say then, sir, that the report drawn up by the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in 1844, asserts that these men were seized upon the eastern coast of Connecticut, on the 26th day of August, 1840, instead of 1839. I will refer to the thirteenth page of the report, to show the intention of that statement, where he admits that they were landed in Havana on the 12th of June 1839; and then says that they were *fourteen months* in Cuba, when the records of the courts show you that they were only sixteen days in Cuba.

This misrepresentation, as I understand, was put forth to show that the court could not determine whether these Africans had been long resident in Cuba or had been recently imported. That is the inference which the author draws from his own misrepresentation. I leave it to every man to say whether the misrepresentation was intended or not. The records of the district court of the State of Connecticut show that this claim of Ruiz and Montez was filed on the 29th of August, 1839; that the answers of the Africans were filed on the 19th of September 1839; and that about the 1st of January, 1840, the ship and cargo were libeled by Lieutenant Gidney. Now, sir, even if the author made this error though ignorance or inattention, he has written himself down unworthy of confidence; yet the President would have us influenced by such a report, and he gravely refers to it as an authority to control honest men.

Now, sir, I wish the honourable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, when he takes up this subject, to do justice to his predecessor, and to relieve him from the imputation which his own report has brought upon him. Let the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Bayly] stand forth and put his own construction of the facts of the case upon the record. Let his committee wipe from the chairman and members of the former Committee on Foreign Relations the stigma of falsifying the judicial records of the nation, for the purpose of perverting the influence of this Government to the maintenance of the African slave trade. Gentlemen know whom I mean when I refer to the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was a Representative in this Hall from Philadelphia, and I call upon every member from that city, and from the State of Pennsylvania, to give explanation, if it exists, in regard to this falsification of the record.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I cannot do better in my argument than to refer to the words of the judge who decided this case. They are as follows:

"It is plain beyond controversy, if we examine the evidence, that these negroes never were the lawful slaves of Ruiz or Montez, or any other Spanish subjects. They are natives of Africa, and were kidnapped there, and were unlawfully transported to Cuba, in violation of the laws and treaties of Spain, and the most solemn edicts and declarations of

her the relations which subsisted under the laws of the Government from which she sailed; or, as was intended, the relations of master and slaves; may be carried by a slave ship into Connecticut, New York, or New London; and that the slave dealer shall have the right to whip his slaves, to cast them overboard, or shoot them, as they would under the laws of a slave-dealing nation from which she sailed. This was done by a vote of the Senate, and it is quoted as evidence of the law of nations. While I would speak respectfully of that body, it becomes me to speak of them with perfect plainness and perfect sincerity.

Now, these resolutions of 1840, which are quoted as evidence of the law of nations, were *manufactured to order*. The American slave ship Enterprise was driven, from stress of weather, into Port Hamilton, in the Island of Bermuda; when she arrived, under the operation of British laws, the slaves were of course free. And the slave-dealers interested in the cargo called upon our Executive to demand of the British Government compensation. The Government referred to the law of nations, by which a ship coming within the jurisdiction of a friendly nation becomes subject to her laws. And such is the case as regards our own coast, and the coast of every other civilized nation in the world. Our jurisdiction extends over the whole country, over our rivers and bays and gulfs, and for the distance of a marine league into the ocean. When a ship comes within a marine league of our shore, our revenue officers board her in the discharge of their duties, our health officers investigate the condition of her "bill of health," our pilots conduct her into port, and receive their compensation for the same, and whatever questions arise as to acts committed on board the vessel, are decided according to the laws which regulate the port at which she arrives.

To change this rule of international law, the Senate of the United States passed resolutions which held the law to be different. That body attempted to modify, to repeal the law to which I have referred. The resolutions were brought up—and now I wish to address myself to Whigs, and not to Democrats, when I say *not a Whig north of Mason and Dixon's line dared vote one way or the other*. They dodged the question. They dared not take any position at all. Do not understand me as entertaining any want of respect for those men who fled. I despise the act, while I honour the men—as some Whigs stuck to General Scott, while they despised and spit upon the platform on which he stood. I speak of it as a matter of history, to go upon the record of the nation, to be known throughout the length and breadth of the land, that men intrusted with the interest of the nation dared not show their hands, dared not vote either for or against these propositions, with the exception of one man from the State of Rhode Island—and I like to see men honest and bold even in their deviltry; that gentleman stood up and voted for the resolution [laughter.]

The resolution was passed; and it was there determined that the law of nations was repealed, modified, moulded into slaveholding shape. But lo and behold! the next day the sun rose in the east and set in the west; and when the next storm swept our coast, every Swedish and French and British vessel making our ports, was subjected to our jurisdiction, and our laws were enforced on board of them. So it was with our vessels which were driven into the ports of other nations. They are treated in the same manner; and one would suppose that these foreign nations never heard of our Senate's having repealed and modified the law of nations. Yet this report is based upon such a resolution as that.

If I had time, I could go back to the year previous, when Captain Wendell with his ship from Boston [I think], while in the port of Havana, was taken by Spanish officers, sent to prison under Spanish authorities, and punished by Spanish laws.

The year following arose the case of the brig Creole, a slave ship from Richmond, Virginia, in which, being within twenty-four hours' sail of New Orleans with her cargo of slaves, when they rose upon their keepers, asserted their right to freedom in spite of the piratical slave-dealers having them in charge, one of whom they laid low in death, just as you, Mr. Chairman, and I would have done—just as every man would do who has the heart and feelings of a man—just as Washington and his compatriots did when they cast off the oppression of the mother Government. They went into Nassau, in the island of New Providence, and, of course, being under British laws, were free.

The parenthetical administration of John Tyler called on the British Government to pay for them. The letter of Secretary Webster, giving instructions to our Minister at the Court of St. James, was published. It seemed to pledge the influence of the nation to the support of the slave trade.

In this hall they were met by resolutions denying such power. The humble individual presenting them was driven from his seat here; but by that act the country was aroused. The attention of the people was called to the subject. The public press spoke out, and that demand upon the British Government was dropped. Can any man tell me what has become of it? Can my friend from Virginia [Mr. Bayly], the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, tell me how much that Government paid for the slaves?

Mr. BAYLY. I can inform the gentleman, if he will yield me the floor?

Mr. GIDDINGS. I will yield for a categorical answer. I do not like to yield the floor now for remarks; but I hope he will reply at length, as soon as he gets the floor. It was when the popular sentiment of this nation was heard, that Mr. Webster himself backed out of the position assumed in his letter of instructions; and neither Whig nor Democratic Administration has ever renewed them. Mr. Polk, General Taylor, and Millard Fillmore never again demanded compensation for those slaves; and when Daniel Webster came back to the office of Secretary of State in the last Administration, he was never heard to advocate this claim, or demand restitution of the British Government. If I am in error, I hope the gentleman from Virginia will correct me. I may be wrong, but I give the history as I have heard it. I have made the assertion before upon this floor, and gentlemen have gone to the Departments with a view of ascertaining the facts, and have come back satisfied with the truth of my statement. There may be some recent action upon this subject of which I am ignorant. If so, I hope the gentleman will set me right. I hope he will inform us what Administration has renewed this infamous demand upon the British Government, for compensation for the bones, and blood, and muscles of American born subjects? If so, let the fact go forth to the people of this nation; and let them understand distinctly who it is that seeks to involve them in the crimes, iniquities, and unutterable guilt of dealing in human flesh.

I have hurried over the subject much more rapidly than I intended to do, and have not alluded to many points to which I wished to direct the attention of the Committee. Should I think it best to write out my remarks, I will supply those omissions. I will only say at this time, in conclusion, that the part of the Presidents's message in which reference is made to the Amistad affair, is calculated for the Southern section of the country, and that part relating to the Koszta affair was doubtless intended for the advocates of freedom. The question of Slavery has become the great overshadowing, overpowering, and absorbing issue which now agitates the people throughout the length and breadth of this land. The only question before the American nation is, shall the powers of this government be prostituted to the maintenance of Slavery and the slave trade, or shall they be appropriated to the maintenance of the rights of human liberty?

Those Africans, while sailing on board the Amistad, breathing the pure air of heaven, felt as Jefferson felt when he declared that "all men were created free and equal." They felt as our fathers felt when they asserted, in the face of the civilized world, that "all men are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and happiness." To condemn them, is to condemn Washington, Warren, and every patriot of the Revolution. To condemn them, is to condemn upon the page of history every patriot who has heretofore struggled for freedom.

Now let me again repeat to my friend from New York [Mr. Dean] that his colleague [Mr. Smith] made no allusions, that I was able to discover, to any political parties, but I do allude to them; and let me say, that every member here is arrayed upon the side of freedom or oppression. These Africans, when they felt the immortal spirit of freedom stirring within them, raised their arms in the same spirit that animated our fathers of the Revolution; and they struck for liberty, and God be thanked they succeeded in obtaining it! They saw on yonder continent their beloved homes, their country, their kindred, and their friends, from whom they had been ruthlessly torn by Spanish pirates. Who will vote for compensation to these Spanish slave-dealers, to pay them for their loss of anticipated speculation in human flesh, from the hard earnings of northern freemen? Following the instincts to which I have alluded, these Africans took possession of the ship. It was a lawful prize. They were at war with the pirates who held them in subjection. And they maintained those rights when they came into possession of the ship. No vessel captured by the Americans in the late war with England was more morally or properly obtained than the Amistad. They had a perfect right to demand of Ruiz and Montes that they should take them back to Africa. These men with the entire understanding and knowledge that they were imported slaves, thereby became participators in the guilt of the original importers; and the carrying of the Africans to Principe was as great a crime as the taking them originally from Africa. They were as guilty as those who brought them into this country, and deserved at the hands of civilised men the gallows as much as ever pirates deserved that punishment. If we, as a nation, hold that men are guilty of piracy who deal in human flesh, and when they shall be arrested in that guilt, that they are unfit for human association and worthy of death at the yard-arm of our men-of-war, shall we relax that rule in this case, and instead of awarding the gallows to Ruiz and Montes pay them for their crimes?

Gentlemen, give your votes frankly; and if the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs reports a bill, let the yeas and nays go upon the record; let northern gentlemen record their names in favour of paying these Spanish pirates for their misfortunes in slave dealing. Let that record go before the country, and show who were in favour of such a bill, and who against it.

But, sir, I leave this subject to the decision of that great tribunal before which we all tremble—I mean the people. They will take care of the issue and decide it for themselves. For sixteen years I have witnessed in these Halls, the progress of this issue between Liberty and Slavery; and let me say that it stands more prominent and more powerful to-day here, and throughout the country, than at any former period. Most heartily do I thank the President for placing this issue of indemnifying the Amistad slave dealers so prominently before the nation—before the people. I thank him for presenting an opportunity for its discussion.

The result of the agitation of these subjects has always been to drive men to take their positions with reference to Slavery; but no question is better calculated to do that than this issue. It compels the representatives upon this floor to stand forth unveiled to the scrutiny of their constituents, and to the scrutiny of the country. Sir, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Bayly] for the intimation he has given us, that he will present a bill for our action. Let him bring it before us; let it be discussed here; and let us decide the question, whether we will make up the losses of these Spanish pirates. Let each member determine the question for himself, as he feels willing to answer to his people.

And now let me say, as was so beautifully expressed yesterday, that in that future day, when we must each and every one of us stand before that dread tribunal which awaits us in the future, when our acts will be unveiled before all mankind, there can then be no shrinking behind the Administration. Those fugitive slave enactments, passed in violation of God's laws, will not shelter you nor me for violating the rights of humanity, or for trampling under our feet the laws of our Creator.

Mr. WALSH obtained the floor.

Mr. BAYLY, of Virginia. I ask the gentleman from New York to give me the floor a moment for the purpose of explanation?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. BAYLY. I desire, then, to say that the speech just made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] is full of errors, both of law and of fact; errors which, at some future time, will be exposed.

Mr. GIDDINGS. No threats. No threats.

Mr. BAILY. I do not propose to make any threats. I only want to ask that the House will not prejudge the merits of this case; for, I repeat, that the argument so elaborately gone into by the gentleman from Ohio is full of errors, both of law and of fact.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Which I suppose the gentleman will pledge himself to show.

Mr. BAYLY. Yes, sir, I pledge myself to show it when the proper opportunity shall present itself.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Walsh], who holds the floor, to give way for a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the gentleman to allow me a moment for personal explanation.

Mr. WALSH. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to take no part in the discussion of the question now before the committee, and I should not have troubled the House with a word, but for an assertion, as I understand it, made by the gentleman from Ohio, who has just taken his seat, viz: that a statement made by a former member from the city of Philadelphia was a deliberate and wilful misrepresentation.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I did not say precisely that. I said that I considered it as such, and that I would produce facts to prove that it was such.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not knowing who was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1844, and knowing who was the representative of the *city* of Philadelphia at that time, I felt anxious to interpose a word with reference to my immediate predecessor. I now understand that reference was had, not to that gentleman, but to his kinsman, who then represented a district of Philadelphia county, adjoining that which is contained in the city.

The reference, however, is to a gentleman and a scholar, whose fault of being a Democrat of course I condemn and deeply deplore, but of whom, in his absence, such a charge should not be made. He is now one of my constituents, and without feeling that I need make myself his champion, I cannot, with propriety, allow such an imputation—and to be made in the presence of so many new members—without expressing dissent. The statements and arguments of the report mentioned may be errroneous, but I cannot think that it is right, in the absence of the author, to designate them as wilful misrepresentations. The discrepancies mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, as occurring in the report, are too patent to warrant any supposition of intended error.

Mr. FLORENCE. And no other gentleman from Pennsylvania on this floor would willingly state what he believed to be untrue.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. Walsh] will favour me with the floor for one moment. I trust he will extend to me the same courtesy he extended to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH. I feel under an obligation to decline the request.

[Loud cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Speech of Mike Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. I had intended to make some remarks at length on this question, but I have too much regard for the feelings of an already exhausted House, and too much respect for myself, to indulge in those remarks to day.

I am not so desirous of making a speech that I will attempt to do so now, but shall confine myself to one or two suggestions in regard to the course which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] has undertaken to-day. Among theologians, as a general thing, when a man undertakes to be pious, when he gets what, in theological parlance, is called religion, he is taken kindly by the hand and is prayed for, and encouraged. He is not repelled and repulsed. And when one of my Soft friends from New York, who is in what may be said to be a chrysalis state of Abolitionism, and is gradually softening, and becoming encouraged by the regularly-avowed agitation of the President is entirely disposed of, and all the inducements for men to belie and falsify their humanity have passed—I say, when such men might be found gradually softening until they are dissolved in the political cess-pool of their Abolitionism, I think it is at least impolitic, not to say ungenerous, on the part of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] to have met these attempts which the Softs of New York have been so studiously making when freed from the contaminating influences of political partisans to renew the coalition which they once formed with them in 1848 [laughter]. Now, sir, the other day a couple of gentlemen stood upon this floor gratuitously to vindicate an Administration which has not been assailed in this House. They thought to draw the true men of New York from their position into an attack upon this Administration—which they never have contemplated; but we have proved ourselves too good tacticians to be caught by that dodge. It was not a little strange, it was not a little ominous, that this gratuitous, this uncalled for defence of the Administration, should have come from men—the one a Free Soiler and the other a Whig—both opposed to the principles on which Franklin Pierce was whirled into the White House. Sir, when the time comes—and it has not come yet—New York will utter her voice; but, thus far, I, and those who co-operate with me, have sat in our seats like orderly and respectable citizens, and like quite and sincere Christians [laughter].

We have sat still and watched and prayed, and the result of it has been a beautiful quarrel between the Abolitionists of the strongest grade and the incipient Abolitionists—a quarrel which I have no disposition to spoil [laughter]. But, sir, let me tell this House that when the time does come for New York to speak—when the time arrives for the *true* Democracy of New York to tell the Administration, or this House, or the country, what they think of its course, New York will speak in language that will admit of no two interpretations. New York will speak in language that nobody will misunderstand. Until that happy day arrives, I shall content myself with returning to my quiet and orderly position [laughter].

Speech of Mr. Wright, of Pa.

THURSDAY, Dec 22, 1853.

The House being in Committee of the Whole,

Mr. WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, spoke as follows:

The opening debate of this House at the commencement of this session has taken a somewhat unusual course. I do not think that the country at large was prepared to anticipate the result, with regard to the opening debates of this House, that we have realized within the last two or three days. I am one of those who believed that, after the great contests the country has so recently passed through, when both the great political parties of the nation seemed to have concluded this warfare, and when the great battle was fought and the victory won—I say, I am one of those who believed that Abolitionism was dead and buried; and until the day before yesterday, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith] exhumed its lifeless body, and dragged it again before this House and the country, I supposed that it was dead and gone; but, like the ghost of Banquo, it is again in this Hall, and before the country. I do not propose to go into a discussion of the abstract question of Abolition. Wiser heads than mine have already not only touched upon, but dissected that subject, until it has not a limb left to its body that is not completely mutilated. I repeat, that at this moment it is lifeless and inanimate; and the eloquence and power of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith] cannot resuscitate its putrid carcass.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I ought not to reply to an argument on the subject of Abolition in this Hall. I know that a large portion of the Democratic party in this House are opposed to renewing the discussion on the question of Abolition. They think, as a great portion of their party thought, that no notice whatever should have been paid to any debate that had a tendency again to bring before the country a question which is fraught with so much evil to the country as that subject is, and would be, if its principles are carried out. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I never can sit in an American Congress with my mouth closed, and hear doctrines advanced such as were advanced here, the day before yesterday, by the gentleman from New York. I refer you, sir, and members of this House, to a single paragraph in the reported speech of that gentleman, and I hope I may have the indulgence of the attention of the committee, while I read the paragraph to which I have referred.

That there may be no mistake, sir, I will read the paragraph:

"I admit that Austria is an oppressor; but is it not equally and more glaringly true that America is a far greater and guiltier oppressor? Indeed, Austrian despotism, compared with our despotism, which classes millions of men, women, and children, with cattle, is but as the little finger to the loins."

And the gentleman placed his hands on his body as he made use of the expression. Now, sir, when I am told, in a high place, that there is a greater despotism in America—free, independent, powerful and gigantic as she is—when I am told there is a greater despotism here than there is in that degraded Austriam empire, I cannot repress my feelings, nor can I permit such talk to go out to the country without a notice of condemnation and without a reprimand, I care not from what source it emanates or who utters it. Sir, that work of exaggerated fiction which has lately gone forth to the world, called "Uncle Tom's Cabin," written by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, the object of which was to impair and diminish the character, the power, the importance, and the social relations of this country abroad, is perhaps unworthy to be noticed here; but when a gentleman, with the high character for talent and learning as the gentleman from New York, comes here to stigmatize his own country, it is time for patriotic men to speak, and to speak openly. The gentleman eulogizes that Goverment which, but a short period ago, formed a combination with Russia and Prussia to blot from the chart of nations the nationality of Poland, and took her share of the spoils in the division.

There was despotism, sir, in that act! The gentleman from New York, standing in his place in the American Congress, eulogizes that nation which, but a few years after, not only trampled upon fifteen millions of Hungarians, but made them worse slaves than the slaves of the American States; and in that, I suppose, there was no despotism! The gentleman is the eulogist of a State where the public press is entirely abolished and obliterated, so far as regards all practical purposes, and where the people at this day are in a more degraded condition than perhaps any other people upon the continent of Europe. And that is the country where, according to the gentleman from New York, the despotism is inferior to the despotism of this great and mighty Union! Had the gentleman never heard of a certain General Haynau, I think his name was, who, commanding an Austrian army upon Hungarian territory, butchered and slaughtered indiscriminately, men, women, and children; and does *he* come within the broad terms of the eulogy that the honourable gentleman from New York applies to Austria? A monster in human form, and whose only passion seemed to have been to know how much blood would flow from Hungarian veins. And who, afterwards, when mobbed by the brewers of London, instead of being drenched in the horse-pond, should have been hung upon Judge Lynch's gallows. A man destitute of feeling, and deaf and blind to all the common sympathies of life. A man in proportions, but a monster in mind and disposition

Mr. Chairman, I must have the candour to say that, with regard to those gentlemen who differ from me on the subject of Abolition, I am willing to accord them all the merit and honour that flow from a somewhat overgrown philanthropy; but when they ask me to indulge them in that philanthropy, at the fearful expense of degrading the honour of my country and my country's flag, I cannot consent to look upon their conduct with the least grain of allowance. I had supposed, as I remarked a moment ago, that this question of Abolition was dead. Practically it is. It has not in this country at this time even a god-father to stand by it in its extremity. Both the Whig and Democratic conventions, which met at Baltimore, some eigteen months ago, ruled the question of Abolition as effectually out of existence as the Austrian Government, of which the gentleman is an eulogist, ruled out of existence poor, prostrate, dismembered Poland. Upon neither of the Baltimore platforms of the two great parties of this Union dared that hydra-headed monster enter. At this day I do not think there is any respectable body of men—I speak, as a matter of course, of numbers—who have the hardihood to stand up before the American people and proclaim they are identified with that thing which, of all other things, is most to be feared, but which, thank God, is this day as harmless as the infant just ushered into life. It is powerless, and so are its advocates.

And in rising to reply to the gentleman, although, perhaps, it might be saying what I ought not to say here, I am giving character to the position he has assumed, which otherwise would go unnoticed. How long has it been since that question was met and disposed of—and met and disposed of by the best and purest patriots of our country? Why, sir, does the gentleman recollect that, two years since, this subject underwent a full discussion in both branches of Congress; and that men, irrespective of party, marched up to the issue and disposed of it, as they thought, forever? Sir, what were the counsels of those great men, some of whom have left the stage of action, and some of whom are still upon it? What has the gentleman to say in regard to the views of his illustrious friend—as I presume that he was, being of the same political party—the great man, and the celebrated constitutional expounder, who but a few brief months since laid himself down to die, confronting that ocean upon which he had looked with admiration for so many years, and to which he had talked as friend talks to friend, and who died with the blessings of his country on his head; and his acts were fully approved, on this question, by millions of his fellow-men; and a man whose patriotism underwent the test of the age in which he lived, and who lived but to adorn all the social relations of life A statesman in every sense of the word, and, above all, a gentleman.

What shall I say of the counsel of that great man who has but just left the American stage? What shall I say of another great statesman and pure patriot who hailed from Kentucky, and whose lips, in this Hall, touched by the fire of inspiration, for half a century poured out the purest eloquence, and the loftiest patriotism, and whose funereal requiem has scarcely ceased now to vibrate within these Halls? What, also, shall I say in regard to that distinguished man who occupies a proud position in the co-ordinate branch of this legislative body—I allude to the distinguished man who represents, in part, the State of Michigan, and who, but a short time since, when representing his country at a foreign court, rose up, and, in the presence of all Europe, proclaimed to the world the freedom of the seas?

These three men were the men who, but yesterday, in the Senate Chamber of the United States, joined hand in hand upon these compromise measures which have gone forth to the country, and have been adopted as its organic law. After this sacrifice and mutual concession, and mutual forbearance of southern rights and northern rights, after all had been taken into account, are we, at this day, after the question has gone to rest, to be annoyed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith], who comes here to throw a firebrand into the midst of the country, endesvouring, at the same time, to dignify it by his position upon this floor, while he degrades our common country by stigmatising it as a greater despotism than the most despotic power upon the European continent?

I honour the gentleman from New York, sir, for his zeal; but so far as regards his judgment in this matter, at this time, it may be a question admitting of some considerable doubt; his zeal and discretion are by no means evenly matched.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having disposed of that part of the speech which refers to the despotism of this country, I want the committee to bear with me until I make reference to another quotation from the gentleman's address, and which is in keeping with what I have already read and stated to the House. I find this paragraph:

"Alas! sir, what a pitiable spectacle does our Administration present in thus wilfully corrupting Christianity, for the sake of saving so vile and abominable a thing as Slavery? And then, sir, what a pitiable spectacle do the American people present in choosing such an Administration, and in remaining patient under it."

In the estimation of that gentleman, this Administration, indorsing these measures of compromise, after they had been adopted by Congress, and by both of the dominant parties in the United States, upon their respective platforms at Baltimore, presents to the country a most "pitiable" and humiliating position. Why? For its observance of the law? For its adhesion to the Constitution? For doing right in the face of Heaven and of men? Does the gentleman from New York pay due regard to the Constitution and laws of his country? I assume, sir, that he has been sworn as a member of this body, and, having been sworn, I want to refer him to a single clause in the Constitution of the land. I read from the 3d clause, section 11, and article 4:

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

Then I desire to propound to the gentleman a question: How, in accordance with that clause in the Constitution of our country, can he stand up here an advocate of a law that is superior to the Constitution itself?

The gentleman is a renowned and distinguished lawyer, and he has read that clause of the Constitution time and time again. How, then, let me ask him, can he, as a constituent part of this legislative body, put his hand upon the Holy Evangelists, and swear to support the written Constitution of the country, and, at the same time, be the advocate here of a principle which says that there is a higher law than the Constitution of his country? I know no law with regard to municipal regulations, with regard to questions of government, that should be superior, that is superior to the written Constitution of our country. And, sir, if the day shall ever come, in this country, when higher law shall be used as a substitute for the written law, God in his mercy protect us, and the twenty-three millions who enjoy the blessings of free institutions with us.

Mr. SMITH, of New York. Will the gentleman yield me the floor to reply to his question?

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman desire to make a speech?

Mr SMITH. I rose not because I wish to reply to the gentleman's question, for I do not wish to reply to it. But, as he put the question to me, and might deem me uncivil were I not to reply to it, I am willing to reply to it; and I trust that the gentleman will feel no better after my reply.

Mr. WRIGHT. After having called the gentleman out, I cannot refuse him the floor.

Mr. SMITH. The gentleman has referred me to that clause of the Constitution which respects fugitives from service; and it is on this clause that his question is based. Now not to consume the time of the gentleman with any other reason for my denying that the word "service" in the Constitution refers to Slavery, I will only advert to the fact, that three days previous to the close of the convention which framed the Constitution, the committee on style made their report; and that then it was moved to strike out the word "servitude," and to supply its place with the word "service." This substitution was made by a *unanimous* vote, and for the avowed reason that "service" denotes the condition of slaves, and "service" the condition of freemen. I hold, therefore, that the word "service" in the Constitution refers to freemen, and to freemen only. To hold that the framers of the Constitution did after the substitution I have referred to, mean that the word should refer to Slavery, would be to stigmatize them with hypocrisy. I add that the facts I have here given, may be found in the Madison papers.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is not my recollection of the historical proceedings of that convention which formed the Constitution.

Mr SMITH. I refer the gentleman to the Madison papers.

Mr WRIGHT. That is not my construction of those papers. The very change of which the gentleman speaks was made upon the suggestion of a Southern member of that body, who thought it would be better not to introduce the word "slave" into the Constitution, and therefore he moved to strike it out and insert in its place, "involuntary servitude." This is the history of this change, as I think I am prepared to show to the gentleman from New York, to the House, and to the country. And can the gentleman—I am not putting the question to him now with a view of an answer (laughter)—I say, can that gentleman, as a sound lawyer, putting upon the Constitution a proper construction, as he has the ability to do, can he assert that this third clause of the Constitution does not embrace slaves as well as other persons held to involuntary servitude? So the courts have decided. So lawyers have learned it; and none have perused it, I presume, more carefully than the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith].

When that gentleman approached that stand and with the Evangelists in his hand, swore to support the Constitution of his country, upon what principle can he get up here and state that he is governed by a higher power than that which he has sworn to support and obey? No, sir; that gentleman cannot answer that question. It is not susceptible of an answer. There he must swing, upon the position he has fixed for himself.

Mr. SMITH. Will the gentleman allow me to try to answer it? (laughter).

Mr. WRIGHT. No, sir; I cannot allow the gentleman to interfere with my time, for it is precious. Now, having been elected a member of this body, and having sworn to support the Constitution of the country, I maintain that there is no power, either above or below that is superior to that Constitution, which has received his solemn assent, and to support which he is bound by all the obligations of a solemn oath.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what effect the gentleman's speech is going to have upon the country. It has gone out—it has been published—it has been read, I presume, by every Abolitionist in the land; or, if it has not, it certainly will be, for I regard that gentleman as the head and front—the great leader of that very small party—at the present time. But I have no idea that the arguments contained in that speech will make any new converts to the theory.

I think the time has gone by in the annals of American politics and philanthropy when a faction—as the Abolition faction is—will be permitted even to *carry* a firebrand, much less to attempt to *burn* our fair political fabric. They have not the power to do evil, if they have the inclination.

Many years ago, the great State of Pennsylvania, which I have the honour, in part, to represent, and which I am proud to represent—for I do not say as others have said, that it is my wish to have been born in some other part of the Union than Pennsylvania—for I am proud to come here as a Pennsylvanian, and rejoice in the land of my birth—I honour her name and her institutions; but I am digressing. I was about to say that years and years ago, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania abolished from her statute-book, the right to hold persons in involuntary servitude. She did it as a sovereign State; she had a constitutional right to do it; and neither the gentleman from New York, nor any other gentleman has any right to complain of this exercise of this constitutional sovereignty as regards the State of Pennsylvania. In the full plenitude of her power and sovereignty, she acted. She impaired no bond she had entered into with the Federal Government. She violated no pledge. She acted in view of, and consonant with, her own vested rights, and the act being sovereign and supreme, no power on earth had the right to question her motives. And because my State did this act, I rejoice at it, for Slavery, in the abstract, I condemn, but to abolish it elsewhere is an entirely different position, so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, and also the General Government, as to its power to interfere with the domestic relations of the States.

Whether the State of New York was a slave State or not I do not know.

Mr. SMITH. She was.

Mr. WRIGHT. Some gentleman answers the question in the affirmative. I presume that answer is correct. If she were a slave State then, that gentleman will admit that, under the power of the organic law, and under the panopoly of her State sovereignty, she abolished that institution. And what right had the State of Pennsylvania to make any complaint in regard to it? None, sir, whatever.

The States, all will admit, are sovereign and supreme for the enactment of all their internal regulations, except such as they have conceded to Congress, under the Constitution of the United States; but the doctrine of the gentleman from New York, if his theory be carried out and adopted, goes to destroy that sovereignty, and to consolidate all power here; to destroy, for all practical purposes, a combination and league of these respective sovereignties which has conferred countless blessings upon man—which has produced much of the liberty we enjoy at home, and all the advantages which we have experienced in our commercial relations abroad.

It has been said and contended, time and again, that Congress has no power to legislate upon this question. Why, then, does the gentleman from New York drag it before the country, when it is acknowledged, on all hands, that we have no power over the subject—just as powerless as that hand would be if every bone in this arm were broken. Yet, forsooth, this question must be talked about; it must be made the theme for speeches, and time and time again, no doubt, during the present session we shall have the scare-crow of the "death's head and cross-bones" staring us in the face; and, perhaps, before the session is ended, the gentleman from New York will not even know his own bantling.

Now, what shall I say in reply to the honourable gentleman from the State of Ohio [Mr. Giddings]? What shall I say in reply to his observations? Do not let the gentleman suppose that I am putting the question now with the view of obtaining from him an immediate answer [a laugh] I know he is always ready; and will, perhaps, answer at much greater length than I would be willing he should in view of the time allotted me under the rules. By no means let him suppose it [laughter].

Mr. GIDDINGS. I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he desires it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Not at all, at present [renewed laughter] I pay deference at all times to age, and the gentleman from New York is, undoubtedly, many years the junior—at least, such is my impression when I look at the two gentlemen in their seats. But what shall I say to the gentleman from Ohio? He used very hard talk yesterday, when he said that every man north of Mason and Dixon's line was a "dough-face." I would ask the gentleman a question, and will not object to a categorical answer. I would ask him if he lives north of Mason and Dixon's line?

Mr GIDDINGS. I do.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then, according to the gentleman's own assertion, he is himself a "dough-face" [great laughter]. He is in the same catalogue he places the rest of us. He is very kind.

Sir, the speech that the gentleman from Ohio made yesterday I have heard time after time, and again and again, during the last ten years. It is a stereotyped edition, and as the country is bound to be afflicted with it annually, and as we were to have a repetition of it this session, as we have had in former sessions, it was just as well that he should put it to press now, and send it out at this early stage. It was all ready.

Now, as the gentleman has designated every man who resides north of Mason and Dixon's line as a "dough-face," I would ask——

Mr. GIDDINGS. I hope now that the gentleman will allow me to explain.

Mr. WRIGHT. No, no; I cannot. I am afraid the gentleman from Ohio will occupy more of my time than I would be willing to allow; and I do not desire the hour the committee allows me to be filled up with principles and doctrines I abhor.

The gentleman having made this remark in regard to "dough-faces," I merely wanted to make an allusion to it. As to the substance of what he said yesterday, it has been so often replied to in the Congress of the United States, that I pass it by, even without a single solitary remark. It is not my purpose to give him notoriety by noticing his argument.

I desire now to refer the House, and particularly the gentleman from New York, to the concluding sentence of the great speech made by Daniel Webster, in the other branch of this legislative body, on the subject of the compromise measures. I desire the gentleman from New York to listen to the quotation from the speech of that great man. Mr. Webster says in that speech:

"No monarchical throne presses these States together; no iron chain of despotic power encircles them; they live and stand upon a government popular in its form, reputable in its character, founded on principles of equality, and calculated, we hope, to last forever. In all its history it has been beneficent; it has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no States. Its daily respiration is liberty and patriotism; its yet youthful veins all full of enterprise, courage, and honourable love of glory and renown."

But why do I call the gentleman's attention to this speech, delivered by undoubtedly the master-mind of the age in which he lived? I regard Daniel Webster as the greatest spirit of the nation—the man of the most mind. Possessing the profoundest intellect, and the largest judgment of any of his contemporaries. I think there can be no question in regard to that, and no two opinions upon the subject. What I want the attention of the gentleman to is these words: "It has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State." And yet that great country which has "crushed no State," which "has trodden down no man's liberty," is a despotism, in the opinion of the gentleman from New York, worse than the despotism of Austria! The great Secretary, in reply to Mr. Hulsemann, with one brush of his hand, displaced "the patch" which before had represented Austria in the diplomacy of nations. Had the gentleman from New York been an Austrian subject, he would, in all probability, have disappeared with "the patch." He may thank his stars he was not. I hope he may hereafter reflect upon the quotation I have made—and that at least one man in this Union dare assert—that this Government "has trodden down no man's liberty; has crushed no State." Can he say the same of Austria? Let Poland and Hungary answer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have done with Abolition. I have done with it now and forever. I have nothing more to say upon the subject. Let its bones be reinterred—and to the gentlemen from New York and Ohio I assign the duties of doing it burial. During my official term in the Thirty-Third Congress, I have given my views, not upon the abstract principle; I have only made a few commentaries upon what the gentleman from New York has assumed to himself to utter.

[The remainder of Mr. Wright's speech related to other topics, and was of no special interest.]

Speech of Mr. Philips, of Alabama.

FRIDAY, Dec. 23.

The House being again in Committee of the Whole,

Mr. PHILIPS, of Alabama, said, the question before the committee was the reference of the President's message; and yet, from the latitude of debate, not only had the principles of the message been involved, but the question of Slavery, the conduct of Captain Ingraham, the Koszta affair, and the constitutionality of the act of 1849, which invested in the Secretary of the Treasury the appointment of Assistant Secretary. And whatever else was to be involved in the discussion, or on what other unknown sea they were yet to be launched, no one could tell; not even that notorious person, the "oldest inhabitant."

He could not say that he was surprised by the sentiments which fell from the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith], and from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings], though he confessed the sentiments in themselves were somewhat startling. He repeated, he was not surprised, because those stereotyped sentimentalities which issue from the lips of Abolitionists had fallen too often on the ear of the country to excite at this day the least emotion of surprise. Invective, unmeasured and unsparing abuse, had been poured out by the gentlemen on the institutions of the South, and Southern members have maintained their seats in quiet, in decorum, and without reply. Nay, more, they had been called on to listen to the remarks of those who, denying the obligation of their constitutional oath, would falsify history and the plain provisions of the Constitution to support and sustain them in the violation of their pledged faith.

This institution of Slavery had been inherited. It was sacred to him by the Federal compact. He would not lend himself to do what he knew was the cherished object of those gentlemen; that they might establish this place as the centre from which they may speed their fiery arrows to every section of the Union to light up a flame of discord. When the Constitution shall fail to secure Southern rights, for which it was ordained, he was strong in the expression of the belief that this institution had inherent power enough to protect itself.

He then referred to what he termed the novel idea of Mr. Smith, of New York, namely, that Secretary Marcy did not go further than he did in the Koszta affair, and declare to the world that even if Koszta was not a citizen of the United States by law, he was one by the rule of reason and justice. He said that citizenship exists only under the conditions, limitations, and restraints, which the law imposes. But the sword of Captain Ingraham and the pen of Secretary Marcy are destined to joint immortality.

[From this point the debate turned upon other topics.]

SKETCH OF MR PALFREY'S LECTURE

THE Second Lecture in the Course of the New York Anti-Slavery Society was delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, December 20th.

Mr. PALFREY commenced by stating that unless he read the signs of the times wrongly, we were in great danger in this country of losing altogether the benefits which had been secured to us in the past. When we spoke of the Roman Empire, every one understood that the iron military despotism was referred to, under which there was no protection to life, liberty or property. Of all governments, the most objectionable was that of a pure aristocracy. There was nothing in history more awful than the administration of the aristocracy of Venice. That tremendous power superseded the Republic. Never had Democratic forms been more regularly kept up at Athens than prior to the establishment of the oligarchy; and it would not be surprising, indeed, if American citizens should one day find themselves the most abject slaves when they suppose themselves boisterous Democrats. Precisely such a kind of power as that which ruined Athens was the slave power in this Republic. Unless we exercised an unbounded vigilance, and were decisive in our action, we would at no distant day be one of the overthrown Republics. Cassandra got no ear at Troy, and it was because she did not tell the truth; but voices proclaimed, with no power to controvert the assertion, that an aristocracy can be organized out of an association of slave-owners. Majorities governed in Athens down to the very day when the four hundred pronounced the Republic at an end. The "Hard and Soft" controversy then existed as now. Mr. Calhoun was no jobber; neither was Antiphon. Both loved their order, and both worked with an unrelenting energy to accomplish their ends. The aristocracy of England governed the realm because it controlled the Parliament. The slave power in this country controlled the Legislature. The landed power of England controlled the upper house of Parliament, and the slave power in America exercised the same power in our Senate. The supreme authority of the United States actually existed in and was exercised this day by one hundred thousand persons residing in one half of the States of this Union, and to them twenty-one millions of free men bowed in submission. In the Slave States the property holder and the slaveholder were almost synonymous terms, because the moment a man had acquired means

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1853.

IMPORTED REPUBLICANS.

It is well known to all who are (or ever have been) *gourmets*, or connoisseurs in wine, that there are some certain vintages of so delicate a flavour, of so etherial an aroma, that they cannot survive a sea-voyage. If not absolutely spoiled and good for nothing when they arrive on this side the Atlantic, at least they have lost "the divine perfection of their first being" and been converted into a very washy and insipid, if not deleterious, beverage. There are some political and moral virtues which seem to have as little "body," as the wine-merchants would call it, as these children of the Sun, and equally incapable of enduring the breath of the sea-breezes and the heavings of the Ocean billows. The love of Liberty used to be regarded as a virtue of a hardy growth. Milton called the object of that passion a "Mountain Nymph," one that had been nursed in the thin cold air of Alpine heights, and trained by a life among precipices and avalanches, "to suffer and be strong." But we have changed all that, as well as many other matters of opinion, in these "old days of the world," as Lord Bacon describeth modern times. Liberty herself is a very different goddess from what she was in the days of the inspired Roundhead. She was then always on foot and actively pressing forward to the things that were before. She is now sitting down, resting herself after her labours, and looking backward at the things that are behind, as any one may see that will examine her effigies on the medals struck in her honour by the Model Republic, the possession of which is the most earnest ambition of its inhabitants. She has taken off the Liberty Cap, which symbolized her own emancipation, and has put it on the point of her spear, to intimate that she is read to run any contemporary slave through the heart that shall attempt to crown himself with it, without her permission. The object of the love having thus changed its character, it is not surprising that the passion itself should have been modified also.

At any rate, the love of Liberty is of so queasy a constitution in these coster-monger days that it will no longer bear transportation, any more than Chablis or the finer Burgundies. It is, almost invariably, found to be "pricked," to borrow a phrase again from the vintner, and good for little but to be cast out and be trampled under foot of men. This is, very likely, owing to the adulteration of the article and the way in which it has been drugged or "doctored" for the particular market to which it was to be exported. In its pure state, as we conceive, it is the desire of lawful liberty for ourselves and all the world beside. As generally offered to the public, now-a-days, it is the desire of being free ourselves, at the expense of any quantity of Slavery for other people. A Republicanism that was crushed out of the wine-pressed Austrian oppression, and which in Hungary included all mankihd, could not be imported to America for a market, without being reduced by large infusions of native growth, which excludes one-sixth of the population from the idea. A Republicanism which had sprung up under the tramplings of the Saxon in Ireland, and which was loudly bragged of as a "neat" and genuine article, when brought into the port of New York must receive the brand of American Slavery, before it can be permitted to make glad the heart of the American People. We are very particular as to the quality of the foreign Republicanism we admit into our market. If the Boards of Health were but half as scrupulous as to deleterious articles of meat and drink which are offered to the lieges, the sanitary condition of the nation would be much higher. But we insist upon the imported article being identified with that we make at home, and which we protect by much more stringent Tariffs than any invented for the benefit of Cotton and Coal, or else we will have none of it.

We have been led to these reflections by the Report of the Banquet given, the other day, to John Mitchell, the Irish Patriot. We are not disposed to question the Irish Patriotism of that gentleman. Without entering into the consideration of the character of the Movement with which he was connected, and admitting that he had proved his sincerity by his sufferings there, we claim that we have a perfect right to examine his Democratic Idea, by the test which is furnished by our Democratic Idea. We need not go far for the touchstone. By whom was this Banquet spread? The man chosen to preside over it must be a fair sample of their quality. And who was he? The District Attorney of the United States, CHARLES O'CONOR, one of the noisiest of the Castle Garden Union-Savers, one of the chiefest of the Hundred Slave-catchers—the man who looks upon the President that made him as an Abolitionist and a Traitor, because he would not shut the gates of mercy on every man who breathed an opinion against Slavery, however deep may have been his penitence, and however public his recantation. When such a man sits at the head of the board, we may easily imagine the character of those that surround it. This tool of our Republican tyranny, who holds his office only by virtue of his readiness to seize and send back to their despots the John Mitchells that may have escaped from them, could speak of the "Union which bound together those of the Old World, who seek and strive for Liberty, and ourselves of the New World, who are blessed in the enjoyment of it!" And Mr. Mitchell, in his reply to the toast which welcomed him "to Freedom in America," most carefully remembered to forget that there was any such thing as Slavery here. What a wet blanket would not the faintest allusion to the fact that there were fugitives from tyranny, perhaps within the sound of his voice, certainly within the circuit of the city, whom the Chairman and almost every man at the feast were ready to return to it on demand, have been to the enthusiasm of the hour! But no such skeleton was uncovered by his hand at that Banquet.

So it was with the speech of Mr. Meagher. It was a carefully prepared and eloquent performance. Had there been nothing to convict him of inconsistency, it would have been an unanswerable, as well as a felicitous, effort at oratory. But, coming from a man who has been two or three years in the country, who has been through the Southern States, and discoursed of Liberty alongside of the auction-blocks of New Orleans, we must be permitted to regard it as no better than a Rhetorical Flourish. We have much compassion for men who have undergone personal hardships, imprisonment and exile for the sake of Ideas, but our compassion cannot be mingled with respect as long as they toutly accept Ideas worse than the worst of those against which they rebelled, as the price of sympathy for themselves. We think these exiles from European despotisms have great cause of complaint, and of contempt, against those Americans who, while vociferous Democrats at home, are the most supple of tuft-hunters and of toad-eaters abroad. But we do not see much to choose between them and the foreign Democrats who humble themselves before the more despicable despotism of our Slaveocracy, in the vain and desperate hope of conciliating its assistance. We did not expect anything better of these gentlemen. Their aim was a limited one and regarded only their own deliverance and their own advantage. But their wrong to the oppressed everywhere, worked by their silence as much as it could be by their speech, is made none the less by this fact. What Mr. Mitchell complains that Secretary Marcy is doing for him, he is virtually doing to three and a half millions of oppressed men, as good before God as he.

We are rather surprised to find that these gentlemen do not seem to have profited by the experience of their predecessor, M. Kossuth, and really appear to expect that the American people will, sometime or other, do something for the oppressed Nationalities of Europe! Mr. Mitchell hopes that America may prove to be the fulcrum of the lever which is to move the Old World! Poor man! He will soon find that princes' favours are more to be relied upon than those of Slaveholding Democrats. He will find, as M. Kossuth did, that the governing influences of this country are as bitterly hostile to popular movements in Europe as Nicholas or Napoleon. They have the instinct which makes all tyrants kindred. The European patriots will as soon find aid and comfort from Pius or Francis Joseph as from our Slaveholding Oligarchy. Mr. Marcy was the organ by which that Power spoke. And though Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Meagher may speak and print, and eat and drink, destruction to the Saxon, they will never be permitted to do anything that will compromise the peace of the country and endanger the transit of cotton. They will learn by experience, if they will not believe it on our assurance, that a Despotism is a Despotism still for all it calls itself a Republic. They may be made the occasion of airing uniforms and of imbibing turtle soup and champagne; but for any substantial aid, they may as well turn to the Pope or the Czar at once. We trust that they will learn, from what they have before them, that the Cause of Liberty, like the Cause of Tyranny, is one and indivisible, the world over, and that it is of no use to look for help against a despot with a sceptre to one with a cat-o'-nine-tails in his hand. Such a hope is as vain as the compliances it induces are base, and unworthy of consistent lovers of human freedom.—E. Q.

AGITATION IN CONGRESS.

The political wiseacres, who flattered themselves that Anti-Slavery Agitation had been forever silenced by the Compromises of 1850 and the triumphant election of Franklin Pierce to the Presipency, must feel their self-complacency not a little disturbed on finding that the hated question is the very first to obtrude itself into the debates of the new Congress. It comes up, too, legitimately, in connection with topics introduced to the attention of that body by the very President whose election, it was supposed, had put a final extinguisher upon the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country. The slaveholders, having once humbled the North through the treachery of her own representatives, flatter themselves that there is now no limit to their power in any department of the Government; that they may safely demand of the President and of Congress any measures which may be necessary to the perpetuity of their darling institution. Hence their heads were never so full of schemes for the aggrandizement of Slavery as at the present time. They have come up to the present Congress with such a multiplicity of axes to be sharpened upon the national grindstone, that the subservient North, which has so long and so patiently toiled at the crank for their accommodation, is in danger of becoming rebellious at last from sheer exhaustion! The South, by improvidently following up the advantage she gained in the recent struggle, may yet provoke a contest that will reveal to her a *North* of a very different temperature from that which has hitherto been laid down upon the political maps. The saying of the wise man, that "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall," may perchance find its most significant illustration in events soon to transpire in the history of the Slave Power. However that may be, one thing is certain, viz.: that so long as the slaveholders compel the President to bring before Congress projects so infamous as that for paying Spanish pirates for the victims that have escaped from their toils, it will be impossible for them to stay the progress of Anti-Slavery agitation.

A large portion of our space this week is occupied with a debate which was opened by GERRIT SMITH, and which, though for a time suspended, will, we apprehend, be soon re-opened. Mr. Smith's Speech, as reported in the *Globe*, was already in type, when a letter from him informed us that that report was incomplete and that he would soon furnish us with a pamphlet edition revised and corrected by himself. We therefore cancelled the first report, with the intention of giving the revised speech to our readers, if possible, next week, but at any rate very soon The speeches of Messrs. Preston (of Kentucky) and Dean (of New York) in reply to Mr. Smith, that of Mr. Giddings in reply to Mr. Dean, and upon the case of the Amistad, the brief remarks of Mike Walsh, the elaborate (abortive) effort of Mr. Wright (of Pa.), and the short address of Mr. Philips (of Ala.), we copy as reported in the *Globe*.

Mr. Smith, in leading off upon the discussion of the President's Message, exhibited a courage for which we honour him. He disregarded the precedent by which, hitherto, new members have been constrained to observe silence until the 'old stagers' of the House have had their say. This rule may be well enough in its application to many of those who find their way to the Halls of Congress, but it is manifestly absurd when applied to such a man as Mr. Smith, whose knowledge of public affairs is equal to any emergency, and whose peculiar position requires not "a masterly inactivity," but great boldness, promptness and tact. Instead of following the example of Mr. Sumner, by forbearing to utter his sentiments until, by private intercourse with Southern members, he could acquire an influence over them and satisfy them that he is neither a fanatic nor a madman, he has chosen to march boldly up to the work which he felt himself called to perform, and to *command* their respect by his fidelity to the cause which he professes to serve. For this the friends of freedom owe him hearty thanks, and they will not fail to see in this example of his courage and good sense a happy augury of his future career.

The tone of Mr. Preston's reply indicates a change in the tactics of the South. The attempt to silence discussion by denunciation and threats is seen to be a failure, and hereafter we may hope that Southern members will at least endeavour to meet argument with argument instead of violence. Those who imagined that Mr. Smith would be in danger of assassination may now see how little ground there was for apprehending that such a tragedy would be enacted.

Mr. GIDDINGS's Speech, like all his efforts, was timely, vigorous and bold. His exposure of the iniquitous efforts of the slaveholders to compel the North to pay the Spanish pirates, Ruis and Montes, for the captives of the Amistad, entitles him to the thanks of the friends of freedom, and we hope it may have the effect to arouse them to a sense of the importance of sending in their remonstrances against that scheme of villany and plunder.

In the first part of his speech, Mr. Giddings, it would seem, placed Mr. Smith on the same platform with himself in respect to the power of the National Government over Slavery. We can account for this only by supposing that there is some mistake in the report, for surely Mr. Smith does not stand on that platform, but upon another and a totally different one. He will probably explain himself in reference to that point in due time.

Theodore Parker has recently preached and will soon publish three discourses on "Crime." The subject is an important one, and his views will no doubt command attention.

REV. T. K. BEECHER'S LECTURE.

Hon. JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS being prevented by sudden illness from fulfilling his appointment, the Third Lecture in the New York Anti-Slavery Society's Course was delivered, on Tuesday evening last, at the Tabernacle, by Rev. THOMAS K. BEECHER, who, on short notice, kindly consented to fill the very important vacancy. He took a survey of the Anti-Slavery controversy from what he regarded as the *Christian* standpoint. Admitting, to the full extent, the evils of Slavery as described by Abolitionists, he contended that, after all, the system was only one form of that Selfishness with which the whole family of man is cursed, and from which they can be delivered only through the operations of Christianity upon the heart. The Anti-Slavery cause must be carried forward less by the power of combativeness and more under the inspiration of love. Mr. Beecher uttered a great deal of wholesome truth—truth, too, which needed utterance; but we frankly confess that the lecture, as a whole, disappointed us. It seemed to us adapted (not designed) to produce an impression upon many minds that, after all, it is not worth while for anybody to be excited about Slavery *in particular*, since it is only one of a host of evils. He appeared to assume (though he did not say in so many words) that those who had conducted the Anti-Slavery Movement were taking a superficial view of the question; that they did not understand the real nature of the evil against which they are struggling, and that they needed some one to teach them broader views. Now, we honour Mr. Beecher for speaking his own views manfully, but we assure him that his lecture presented no new lesson of comprehensiveness to those who are acquainted with the history and the literature of Anti-Slavery. Abolitionists have always distinctly seen that the work they are trying to do is only a small part of that which must needs be done before the world can be redeemed. They have seen too, and deeply *felt*, that the work must be done in a Christian spirit and by the power of love. In attempting to do a specific thing, they took no superficial view of human relations and affairs, but planted themselves upon principles which they saw were broad and universal. They neither regarded Slavery as the only evil in the world, nor supposed that the sundering of the legal relation between master and slave would be "the end of the law of righteousness."

But, notwithstaading, the lecture was not in all respects what we could have desired it to be, it did not in the least diminish our respect for the down-right frankness and straightforward honesty of the speaker. It was evident that he intended rather to be true to himself and his own convictions than to please his audience, and for this we commend him. In the Anti-Slavery Movement there is scope for individuality in all its forms, and it is only by a generous hospitality for each other's thoughts and opinions that we can arrive at the absolute truth.

The Hutchinson Family being present, volunteered, greatly to the satisfaction of the audience, to sing an Anti-Slavery song before the lecture and another at the close. For this service we, on behalf of those interested in the lectures, return them our heartfelt thanks.

—The next lecture will be delivered by CHARLES LENOX REMOND, of Salem, Mass. Subject: "The Disfranchised American."

LUCY STONE AT ST. LOUIS.

Not for the purpose of advancing the cause of Woman's Rights in a paper pledged to the Anti Slavery cause alone, but as an interesting item of news, we put on record an account of Lucy Stone's reception in St. Louis. Although her efforts at present are devoted to the cause above named, she is yet known and recognised, wherever she goes, as an Abolitionist—yea, a 'Garrisonian' Abolitionist. The people of the slave States do not forget this fact in the generous encomiums which they are heaping upon her head, nor are they blind to the inferences which every one must draw from the favourable reception by them of one of the most earnest and eloquent champions of Anti-Slavery. They have been taught by the Northern press to regard the whole class of speakers to which Miss Stone belongs as a set of raving, reckless fanatics; and finding such representations utterly false as applied to *her*, they will naturally infer that they are equally false as applied to others. Thus, we hope, there will come back to the free States from the South a moral influence that will serve to check the unscrupulous mendacity of the Northern press—a mendacity by which the South has been misguided to her own injury.

Miss LUCY STONE.—The lecture of this gifted lady, yesterday evening, was attended by the largest and most attentive audience we have ever seen assembled in this city. It is a compliment due to her to say that, in our long familiarity with lectures, concerts, &c. we have never witnessed so large, respectable and attentive an audience assembled upon any occasion. We do not know what number of persons can be seated in the Hall of the Mercantile Library—it is estimated at from 1,500 to 2,000. Every seat within the range of our eye was filled, and many could not find admission.

The fair Lecturer was listened to with a profound attention that evinced that her style of expression, the directness of her arguments, the power and force of her truths carried with them a conviction that stifled and subdued anything else than thought and reflection. We have neither the space nor time to review her lecture, but we only express the general feeling when we say that all were pleased, entertained, and the mass gratified and improved. We are pleased to see that her lectures are attended by so many ladies. If they should disapprove of all her theories, they will still find much to *think of*, and reflect upon, and in the lectures will hear nothing to offend the ear or tinge the cheek.

This evening she lectures on the "*Bible Position of Woman.*" From the masterly manner in which she, last evening, sustained her position upon the "Legal and Political Disabilities of Woman," we expect one of the most interesting of her discurses.—*St. Lous Repub., Dec. 20th.*

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.—Miss Lucy Stone delivered her first lecture in this city, on the subject of Woman's Rights, in the Mercantile Library Hall, last evening, to one of the largest audiences we have ever seen assembled in the city. There may have been more persons present at the opening of the Hall, on the occasion of Dr. Dewey's first lecture, but we doubt it. The magnificent Hall was filled in every part, and presented a compact mass of attentive and respectful listeners, that would have been flattering to the highest intellect and most famous name in the country.

There was, unquestionably, a very large proportion of those who were present led more by curiosity to see the young lady whose name has lately occupied so large a space before the public than by any favourable interest in the subject she was advertised to discuss. So persevering, indeed, if not malicious, have been the jibes and derision with which the Woman's Rights movement has been everywhere met, it is fair to assume that a majority of Miss Lucy Stone's audience had prejudged her cause, and went only, as we have before suggested, from curiosity alone, and to obtain fresh occasion for renewed and mayhap original wit at the expense of Woman's Rights.

But we are bound, in justice to the ability, earnestness and severe propriety of the lady lecturer, to say that all who went from such motives were greatly, and we trust agreeably, disappointed. If any went to deride, they derided not. Their premeditated mockery yielded gradually to a deep and heartfelt admiration.

We do not mean that everybody who heard Miss Lucy Stone, last evening, became converts to her doctrine in regard to Woman's Rights. But we do say that, of all the very large audience that listened to her, we do not think there was a solitary person who failed to conceive a decided respect for her clear and strong intellect, or that failed to be moved by her earnest and affectionate pleading in behalf of Women—*our* mothers, sisters, wives and daughters—against the wrongs, neglects and hardships that *we know* them to be subjected to.

Miss Lucy Stone's personal appearance is not such as we had been led to expect. The prurient pens of eastern presses had wrought up rather a fascinating specimen of womanhood, and created a very general impression that most young men, in looking at the lady, would be thinking what a nice wife was spoiled by her very unpalatable doctrines and practice.

Herein was a mistake that most of Miss Lucy's young men auditors discovered last night. She is by no means lacking of good looks. She has a medium stature, good figure, rather a round face, small, pretty hands, and a soft, womanly voice; but there are certain modes of dress and appearance adopted by her that run counter at once to all of men's preconceived ideas of a woman's good points to please them, and these peculiarities give a quiet and almost imperceptible, but yet very effectual, shock to the calculation of being pleased by Miss Lucy's personal charms. The short hair, parted in the middle and combed close down behind the ears, reaching only to the neck and lying close thereon, gives dreary entertainment to the imagination that dwells on long flowing polls or dancing curls.

And so, the plain and rather priest-like gown (for such was the appearance her dress gave to the audience) started sombre thought of sermons, rather than emotions of voluptuous vivacity. With these aids to sober down and settle the minds of the most likely shallow and capricious of her hearers, Miss Lucy Stone soon had the whole house forgetful of herself, and quite intent on the great theme she appeared before them to unfold. By a skilful portraiture of Woman's Wrongs, such as they are known everywhere and in all countries to exist, she easily prepared the audience to believe that something could be done, as they were already convinced that something ought to be done, to right those wrongs.

What the wrongs of women are—how their education is shallow and partial—how their employment is restricted to base or insipid pursuits—how, when they work, and work as well as men, their labour is stinted in remuneration—how their souls are bowed down by utter dependence on man, and often by a vassalage of body, where the heart acknowledges no superiority and no love—how their amusements are few and their triumphs over life none—Miss Lucy Stone depicted with earnest and graceful eloquence, which deserve fuller mention hereafter.—*St. Louis Intelligencer, 20th.*

The *Republican* and the *Intelligencer* are the leading journals of St. Louis, holding there a position similar to that of the *Commercial Advertiser* in New York, or the *Atlas* in Boston. The other papers of the place speak of Miss Stone in equally favourable terms.

MR. PIERPONT'S 'GOLDEN CALF.'

On Monday evening last, Rev. JOHN PIERPONT delivered, at the Tabernacle, a new Poem-Lecture, entitled 'THE GOLDEN CALF.' The announcement of this performance and the promised attendance of the Hutchinson Family drew a large and highly intelligent audience. After the Hutchinsons had sung some of their popular pieces, by which the assembly was put into the best possible humour, Mr. Pierpont came forward and recited his stirring rhymes, of which a brief report is here presented from the *Tribune*.

Notwithstanding the commandment against idolatry, the Israelites called for gods on their priests, who, subservient (as it may be they still are), melted the golden offerings, and from the furnace,

——"My friends, restrain your laugh,
Came out a god—a little golden calf!"

This calf, like Jupiter, often has changed his shape, but

"Whate'er his form and pressure, or his mould,
The real God is latent in the gold."

He is very powerful; prison-bars melt before him. He has travelled from Egypt and received homage in every land, and in many various forms, for of these

——"he has a range;
He even thrives—he almost lives on 'Change."

What is the man of wealth honoured for? Learning—humanity? No! He knows no such words; his talk is of dividends and the like;

——"he is more than half
An incarnation of the golden calf."

You may appeal to him for the widow, the orphan, his fellow man toiling under a scorching sun, whose flesh the

——"——cowhide scores
Till pitying bloodhounds comes and lick his sores;"

You may

"Knock at the heart, or where his heart should be;
You knock in vain—a hard metallic ring
Is all the sound that from his breast you bring."

The Moslem and the Hebrew cry, "There is no God but one;"

"There is no God but one we also hold;
One only God—but then, that God is Gold."

On railways, life, rich in genius, beauty, and affection is sacrificed; but,

"Friends, murmur not, suppress your pitying sighs,
The golden calf demands a sacrifice."

The apostle says life is vapour; therefore vapour is life; therefore the steam engine can give more in a day than it destroys in a year;

"Such is the logic of the golden god,
And road-conductors give th' approving nod."

Fire consumes a vessel at sea; erect on the nearest shore a cenotaph to the lost, and

"Cut deep their names, that future times be told
Who there lie victims to the calf of gold;
Victims, of old, came from the stall and pen,
We crown his altars with our noblest men."

He has other sacrifices; when buyer and seller both lie to save or gain a cent:

"Not life is there the sacrifice, but truth."

While the calf stands by, and,

"Like Jove Olympia, gives a gracious nod,
And inly says—These people know their god."

Parents sacrifice a daughter; she is forced to pledge

"Perpetual faith to one whose only claim
To manhood is his father's note or name;"

and whose beard stands him instead of brains,

"Could she but trade in beards, entirely free,
And get a real goat for that goatee,
'Happy, thrice happy, would the victim be.'"

So a young man is sacrificed to a girl,

"Whose purse is deep, tho' shallow is her brain."

He has, however, the consolation: he may say

"So that she's solid gold, my better half
Is all the better that she's but a calf."

Moloch, a hollow brazen image, was filled with fire, and children placed in his red-hot arms; but the calf receives sacrifices as cruel. A beautiful girl, who loves a worthy youth, is destined by her mother to wed a debauched, but wealthy, old man. She is to be clasped to

"The breast that now glows, and can only glow,
With fires, like Moloch's, kindled from below."

Like the "Star of Empire," the calf "Westward takes his way."

"Amid Nevada's snows he chews the cud,
Or cools his hoofs in Feather-river's mud."

Thither men toil,

"Begging the blatant beast to bear their prayers,
And shake them off some of his shiny hairs."

Even Israel worshipped this calf with feasting, dancing and play; but he is now (more foolishly) worshipped with hunger, thirst and toil.

The discontinuance of human sacrifices to Juggernaut has been purchased; yet, on the Isthmus of Darien, around Cape Horn, and over the plains, the calf receives quite as many victims Shall this mad idolatry continue? The All-wise and Good calls on men to break the chain which binds them to it:

"All other sovereigns in thy heart dethrone,
And serving man, serve the True God alone!"

Several passages were received with hearty applause and loud laughter.

The Hutchinsons then sung several more pieces, after which the assembly dispersed, evidently delighted by the evening's entertainment.

COLOURPHOBIA ABATING.—Mr. Wm. H. Day, editor of the *Aliened American*, in a letter to that paper, gives an interesting account of a visit which he recently made in New York and vicinity. He is an educated gentleman of refined manners and winning address, and it is no wonder that white prejudice against his complexion was put to shame in his presence. He informs us that he was allowed, with his wife and another coloured gentleman and lady, to ride up town in the cars of the Sixth Avenue Railroad, and says:

We record this part of the visit to show that the people are gaining. Time was when these things could not be. We went as gentlemen and ladies, we were treated as such. No white person in the car seemed to be at all astonished, and of course *we* were not. We found that a white lady in the car could politely ask a favour of us, as of any other gentleman, and we tried as politely to gratify her as if she had been coloured.

They were admitted to the Palace, of course, on equal terms, and what is still more note-worthy, were permitted to eat their supper with other folks in the saloon of Mr. Pelleter, no one offering them any rudeness. After this, the party rode from the Palace to Metropolitan Hall, in one of the very omnibuses which formerly excluded coloured people. The white people who were in before them did not seem to know that they were doing something that was unfashionable in consenting to sit by the side of persons whose complexion was darker than their own. Incidents like these show that New York, badly as she has been afflicted with the malady of colourphobia, is now convalescent.

THE *North American Review*, which, for several years past, has been characterised by the blindest and stupidest form of conservatism, has changed hands. Messrs. Little, Brown & Co. (of Boston) are hereafter to be the publishers, while Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, of Portsmouth, N. H., takes the place of Prof. Francis Bowen as Editor. This change it is understood, was demanded by the conservatives themselves, who felt that their cause had been seriously damaged by the musty fogyism of the apologist of foreign despotism.

'Yankee Sullivan,' the well-known bully, appears to have taken up his abode in Boston, where, according to a correspondent of the *Tribune*, he has been doing service for the grog-sellers and the Whigs, who are at present working together to secure the control of the Municipal Government for another year.

REPORT OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The Eighteenth Anti-Slavery Fair of Pennsylvania was held in the Assembly Buildings, in the city of Philadelphia, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th days of December, 1853. It was commenced with unusually brilliant prospects of success. Great efforts had been made to furnish the tables with rare and desirable articles, and, as an additional attraction, the aid of eloquent speakers had been obtained.

Although the admission fee was of twice the usual amount, the saloon was densely crowded at an early hour on Monday evening, and numbers vainly sought admission. During the following days and evenings, an unusual number of persons were in attendance, and the sales were brisk to the close of the Fair.

On the first, second and third evenings, addresses were made by Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison and Charles C. Burleigh.

The Committee gratefully acknowledge the very valuable aid which the Fair received from many liberal and generous donors, both at home and abroad, who, they trust, will feel amply recompensed by its unusual success. The receipts of the Fair proved that our anticipations had been well founded.

Bristol, Byberry, Newtown, Makefield, and Chester County, were represented by their own tables; and donations were received from Middletown, Connecticut, New York, Wilmington, Salem, Mullica Hill, Warwick, Milton, Kimberton, Kennett, Norristown, Germantown, Wrightstown, and Mt. Holly; and from London, Bath, Bristol (Eng.), and Paris.

The receipts of the Fair amounted to more than $2,600, and the profits will exceed $2,000*

The predictions of future success, which the Committee ventured to make in their last Report, having been so abundantly verified, they do not hesitate to recommend to their coadjutors to commence, at an early period, their work of preparation for another Fair, availing themselves of the lessons of wisdom learned from the past, and strengthening themselves with hope respecting the future. MARY GREW, Ch'n.

* When the Treasurer's Report is fully made, it shall be published.

SUMMARY.

BLOOMERISM AT THE CAPITOL.—Mrs. Miller, a daughter of Gerrit Smith, excites a great deal of curiosity in Washington, by appearing in full Bloomer costume.

LONG SERVICE.—Judy, a slave, died in Bradley Co., North Carolina, on the 15th ult., aged one hundred and ten years.

UNCLE TOM.—Our citizens were favoured with this play some four evenings last week. We have understood they had good houses, and the performance was an improvement upon that which we had before.—*Norristown (Pa.) Herald.*

"PUNCH" A DANGEROUS COMPANION IN AUSTRIA.—Two Scottish ladies, travelling in Austria, were recently arrested by the police, and narrowly escaped imprisonment for having in their possession a copy of *Punch*.

AN ETHIOPIAN HERCULES.—A negro at Petersburg, Va., took up and "toted" on his shoulder a hogshead of tobacco from the depot to the Centre Warehouse. It weighed 385 pounds. The Southside *Democrat* says this is a fact.

NEW HOSPITAL.—The preliminary steps have been taken for the incorporation of a Dispensary and Infirmary in the Eleventh Ward for women and children. The Institution to be under the charge of Elizabeth Blackwell, M. D.

IT PAYS WELL.—We learn from a Louisville letter writer that Miss Lucy Stone realized $100 a night for her lectures in that city. Speaking in bloomers is rather profitable. [Well, why should n't it pay?]

The Senate of South Carolina have passed a bill to amend the laws in relation to coloured seamen, which is thought will become a law. It provides that masters of vessels shall give bond and security for the continuance of such persons on board their vessels while in port.

Mr. Justice Meredith, in the Superior Court at Quebec, decided that the operator of a telegraph company cannot be compelled to divulge in a Court of Justice, the contents of a telegraphic dispatch sent or received by him.

In Aaura, a town of 6,000 to 8,000 inhabitants, in Switzerland, the Protestants and Catholics have but one church. They share it peacesably together. What is more, considering man's prejudices, they have but one graveyard, and there their dust mingles.

DEBASEMENT OF CONGRESS.—The Daily *Times* says: "We have no doubt a million of dollars will be in the hands of lobby agents at Washington, to be used in purchasing support for the various projects that will be pressed upon Congress during the coming session."

HOTEL PROFITS.—It is said that the receipts of the Metropolitan Hotel, in New York, show a clean profit of *one hundred and twenty thousand dollars* on their first year's business. The New York, the St. Nicholas, the Astor, and the Prescott House, are all equally prosperous.

RAILROAD CONSOLIDATION.—The new railroad route from Boston to New York city, by the way of the Midland, Norfolk County, Southbridge & Blackstone and Norwich roads to New Haven, is soon to be open for public travel, and will be called "The Boston and New York Central Railroad."

Miss ROSA DOUGLASS, daughter and assistant of Mrs. Douglass, who was tried and found guilty a few weeks since, by the Superior Court at Norfolk, for instructing coloured persons to read and write, having returned from New York, was brought up before the Mayor on Tuesday and held to bail in the sum of $500 for her appearance at the next term of the Superior Court.

A FEMALE ARTIST.—Miss Grover, of this city, who sketches in crayons with great skill and spirit, has opened a studio at No. 442 Broadway, where she is prepared to execute the likenesses of any who wish a good crayon portrait. We have seen a sketch she has lately made of John P. Hale, the distinguished ex-Senator, which is remarkably accurate as a likeness, and spirited in its expression.—*Evening Post.*

FUGITIVE SLAVES.—"We have just met," says the Chicago *Free Press*, "with one of this class of travellers to the land of British freedom: a woman advanced in life, in whose complexion we could detect no trace of African characteristics. Her employment in the land of chivalry was that of a field hand. Her patience held out until her last child was sold down the river to satisfy the claims of her master's creditor's, when, to save herself from a like calamity, she set her face Canadaward."

Advices from Havana to the 22d instant, state that the new Captain General had given notice of his intention to use every exertion to prevent the landing of slaves. While declaring that he will endeavour to intercept and bring to justice those engaged in the nefarious practice, he remarks that he cannot interfere with the negroes after they have been landed, although it may be apparent that they are freshly imported. Quite a brisk business was being done in the markets.

USE OF CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS.—In a ruling upon this subject, in the United States Court at Boston, Judge Sprague decided that a person exhibiting a letter marked "confidential," or otherwise using its contents thus publicly to the injury of the writer or a third party, was guilty of a gross violation of privilege, and might be held pecuniarily liable for damage resulting from such breach of confidence.

HORRIBLE!—The Meigs County *Telegraph* reports that "A man living in Athens County visited Pomeroy, last week, in company with his father-in-law. While there, they became intoxicated, and left town with a jug filled with liquor. On reaching the home of the former, they demanded supper. She requested the husband to hold the babe while she prepared the food. The child becoming fretful, these two men, the father and grand-father, made fiends by alcohol, chopped its head off with an AX."

At the breaking of ground for the commencement of the Lynchburg and Tennessee Railroad at Lynchburg, a clergyman present commenced slowly and solemnly to read a manuscript prayer. At the conclusion, an old negro man, who had been resting with one foot on his spade and his arms on the handle, looking intently in the chaplian's face, straightening himself up, remarked audibly, "Well, I reckon dat's de fust time de Lord has ever been written to on de subject of railroads!"

A RICH SUBSCRIBER.—One of our brethren in Ohio, an old subscriber, who, though a poor man, was always in advance with his paper, has lately been informed by his London lawyer that he is the undisputed heir to one-half of an estate, the whole of which is $60,000,000. May he be preserved from the evil that great riches often bring in their train. And may all delinquents learn a lesson from his example and good fortune.—*Wesleyan.*

BARBARISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.—The "Luca family" were refused accommodations at a hotel in Westfield, on account of their colour. The keeper of that hotel should be "passed round" in the papers, so that the public may avoid stopping at his house for entertainment. The New Haven *Register* says: "The 'Luca family' are respectable and well conducted persons, and deserving of as good treatment as any other 'family;' and, as little of an Abolitionist as we are, we would not patronize a hotel where they had been treated so rudely."—*Commonwealth.*

WOMEN'S RIGHTS IN GEORGIA.—There is a bill before the Legislature of Georgia, proposing that the property of the wife at the time of marriage, shall not vest in the husband, and that all property she may subsequently acquire by grant, or devise, shall absolutely vest in herself and heirs. The husband is to be an ex-officio Trustee of the wife's estate, subject to removal by the judgment of a Court of Equity. He is also empowered to expend the rents, issues and profits of the wife's separate estate for family uses. This project seems to be awakening a deal of earnest discussion, which is not so favourable to the much needed understanding of this question in the South, where the topic has been rendered contraband by connecting it in the public mind with Abolitionism, &c.

NUTS FOR ABOLITIONISTS TO CRACK.—Sometime last fall, says the Mayaville *Express*, the Hon. R. H. Stanton permitted his negro woman to go to New Richmond, Ohio, to see her relations at that place. The Abolitionists of that place prevented her return, and run her off to Canada. Upon her arrival there, she wrote to her master, requesting him to come for her; that she was unhappy, and wanted to come home. Her husband, soon after it was ascertained that she had left, followed her, and has joined her in Canada. He writes home the man who abducted his wife, stole all her money and jewelry, and left her to starve. They both express a warm desire to return home. In their new found land of freedom, they have to work harder, and far worse than in slave Kentucky.

RECEIPTS FROM THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD.—We are happy to inform our friend A. R. that the two last lots that he forwarded on this time arrived here safe and sound. Another lot of four arrived on Sunday morning the 5th on the Western line, three of whom were women and one man, all from Kentucky.

Three more arrived here on Tuesday morning on the northern freight train and they inform us that within nine days there will be over thirty on from the same quarter.

They inform us that the great reason why there are so many of them running away just now is that the slaveholders have been telling their slaves about the fugitive slave bill, which was passed in Congress and that it was soon to be enforced so that it would be impossible for any more to escape and that all of the northern men would have to be slave-catchers, hence the slaves are all trying to get away before the way is entirely hedged up.—*Voice of the Fugitive.*

THE TERRITORIAL COMMITTEES.—Important questions connected with the organization of United States Territories are expected to come before the present Congress, and it would be idle to affect not to see that some of these questions concern the extension of Human Slavery. Let us see, therefore, how the Committees on Territories of the two Houses are constituted.

Senate—Messrs. Douglass, Ill.; *Houston*, Texas; *Johnson*, Ark.; *Bell*, Tenn.; George W. Jones, Iowa; and Everett, Mass.

House—Messrs. Richardson, Ill.; *McQueen*, S. C.; J. L. Taylor, Ohio; *D. J. Bailey*, Ga.; *Wm. Smith*, Va.; Farley, Me.; English, Ind.; *Philips*, Ala.; and *Lamb*, Mo.

—Thus the slave States, with far less than half the population of the Union, have a majority on the Committees having special control of questions likely to arise affecting Slavery, while the representation thereon of the Free States is carefully weeded of all "fanaticism," and is for the most part in fact as plastic as the most ardent propagandist could desire. Rely on it, these Committees have not been so packed without an object. Watch and see!—*Tribune.*

AIDING SLAVES TO ESCAPE.—On Tuesday last, before the Bracken Circuit Court; two negroes named Henry and Isaac Rumsey, were tried for assisting a negro belonging to Walter Lynn to make his escape, some time since. Isaac was acquitted but the jury could not agree as to Henry.

Another free negro named Dr. Perkins indicted for aiding off (by taking across the river) the slave of Blackstone H. Rankins, in September, 1852, was convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years. He is nearly seventy years old.

Two white men—one Cripps, a school teachor, and James Cooper—were indicted for the same offence as the negroes first named. Cripps gave $5,000 bail and was released. Cooper is in jail awaiting his trial at the next May term.

It is generally believed that Cripps will forfeit his bail; and not appear for trial. We understand he declared while lying in jail at Brookville, that he had done noth

Miscellaneous Department.

THE ENDING AND BEGINNING OF THE YEAR.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying clouds, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring happily, bells, across the snow;
The Year is going, let him go:
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

Ring out the grief that saps the mind,
For those that here we see no more;
Ring out the feuds of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife:
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times;
Ring out, ring out, my mournful rhymes,
But ring the fuller minstrel in.

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slanders and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrow lust of gold,
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant men and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

SPEECH OF JOHN MITCHELL,

At the Mitchell Dinner.

MR. CHAIRMAN, CITIZENS OF NEW YORK, CITIZENS OF AMERICA: It makes my pulse beat stronger to find myself in the presence of free citizens, to speak to an assembly of men whom I can address by the name of "citizen." Often, in my native country, I have stood before multitudes of beings, apparently human beings, having the gait and aspect of men, nay, having many of the attributes of man in his natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the national pride, and power, and ambition, that set men above the beasts, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriads of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, nor even of one loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there—loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, yet by solemn award of what they call law I who speak to you was formally deprived of what they call my citizenship; from that false law I have the honour to be an outlaw; the individuals who term themselves the government of my native country, by formal procedure in a place purporting to be a court of justice, divested me of my status and high prerogative as an Irish serf, and thereby doomed me—cruel government—to be, for the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation—it is promotion. The monarchical East casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—"One freeman more, America, to thee!" Since I landed on your happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to guage, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, available value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish rebel or two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Hibernian enthusiasm for one evening. But this explanation will not serve; though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, that I should draw an audience enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard shells or to soft. In political conchology I have no skill—the mystery of hunkerism is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot prove the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, as Catholic theologians show clearly enough. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I derive no pride from the circumstance; because, I abhor a bully, I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war with the weak, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic idea of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram you with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great trading city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousins and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here to-night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud republicans of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How can they possibly (John will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. Perhaps it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer, but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown has sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and ringing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian, Koszta, out of the talons of her two-headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has tried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! rude republicans, where are your manners! Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations! International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will do as much as any of the European powers to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the sceptred conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with it. Intermonarchical comity would be its right name, as an example or two will suffice to show. Louis Napoleon, you remember, ordered the wandering Magyar not to set the sole of his weary foot upon French soil, and he a passenger, too, on board an American ship. This, you might think, was discourtesy. God bless you! it was true politeness—politeness not, indeed, to the homeless exile—not to the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy and comity; it is true he could flog the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, her Gracious Majesty, it would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this species of politeness. You remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor sternly waved them off—the guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but you cannot stop here; and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; it was an act, I do assure you, of the sweetest and most chivalrous courtesy—towards the royal jailer of Naples and the imperial executioners of Vienna. That was the most exquisite politeness, too, which impelled the British ministers to place the foreign residents in London under police surveillance, upon a representation from the Austrian Court; it was true courtesy that made them send constables, a few months ago, to break open Kossuth's house, and search for arms and correspondence. Above all, it was an effort of the most refined urbanity, that stealing of the Italian letters in the English post office, copying them for the use of the King of Naples, and resealing and forwarding them, as if nothing had happened, whereby the noblest hearts in Italy were betrayed to their destruction. I have observed that an English newspaper, published in New York, takes me to task for citing this execrable case of the Bandieras against the English government, calling it an isolated and unique case, and a transaction condemned by Parliament, press and public. If the writer had taken the trouble to look over the Parliamentary Reports, he would have seen that it was not an isolated case, but merely a detected and clearly exposed example of the settled system of British post office espionage—he would have seen that there was hardly a distinguished statesman of Britain, these thirty years back, who did not steal letters, and that amongst them was the truly liberal Lord Morpeth—his present title I forget. He would have seen that Parliament did not disapprove the practice, but distinctly approved and sanctioned it, by throwing out, with large majorities, a resolution condemnatory of it—he would have seen that detective eaves-dropping is still the law and the practice; and, finally, he would have known that the liberal Lord John Russell, in voting against all inquiry into the practice, and all interference with it, could only regret (I cite his own words) "that the practice could not be so effectual now as before the exposure had been made of its existence, which would act as a kind of warning." Mr. Secretary Marcy says that the United States government will do as much as any of the European nations to maintain tranquillity. And he shows his good feeling and courtesy towards the crowned heads by terming their fugitive enemies adventurers and seditious propagandists. I would that I could know whether this Secretary does truly herein represent the sentiment of the nation. Has America indeed as deep an interest in the tranquillity of Ireland, and Hungary, and Germany, under their several Emperors and Kings and Grand Dukes, as those Emperors, Kings and Grand Dukes themselves? And if America has a mind to engage in this contest of politeness, where will she stop? Will you place detectives to watch our houses, and to dog our motions? "America will do as much!" Will your Postmaster-General (forgive me for imagining the bare possibility of it) soften the seals of our letters, and imitate the impressions, and copy the contents? Shall we never take a letter from the postman without carefully examining to see whether any comity has been practised upon our sealing wax? But what am I speaking of? Am I not in America? It was not for this the farmers and traders of these colonies fought and conquered. The courtesies of this country I believe are due to the people of Europe, not to the people's masters and enemies. And how deeply those poor people need—how richly they deserve—your sympathy! Do you know who and what manner of men are they?—the refugees of '48, whom that secretary calls adventurers and seditious propagandists? They are the very flower of Europe, and the very salt of the earth—the proud, thoughtful students, the inspired poets, the knightly soldiers of freedom and right. A French officer has well said that the genuine representative of ancient European chivalry is now the chivalry of young democracy—the chivalry that goes as gaily to the barricade, when duty calls, as to a *fete champetre*—with the courage of a lion to face tyrants, and the gentle courtesy of a woman to the weak and the poor. And where are they now? In the swamps of Cayenne they tend the sugar cane, or they are hoeing corn in the penal farms of Algeria. Somewhere in Ohio, wanders and feeds his hogs, the German Uhland. O heaven! Apollo is once more among the herdsmen of Admetus, and the herdsmen know not that it is the sun-god. On some tropical palm tree hangs now the silent harp of Ferdinand Freiligrath; in silence he devours his heart, and song comes to him never, never more. These two men were members of the Frankfort convention—their tricolour is trampled down, and by the rivers of Babylon they sit and weep. Garibaldi moulds candles, or curries hides, or commands a trading brig. Pacing the forest paths of Van Dieman's Land, listening to the murmuring Derwent, or studying with the zeal of an undergraduate, I see the stately O'Brien. So calm is his mien, so haughty is his eye, no man can see that his heart is breaking. Americans, will you call these men adventures and seditious propagandists? Will you warn them against fraudulent machinations tending to disturb your genteel friends, the sovereigns of Europe? Once more pardon me the question. The Mayflower pilgrims were adventurers—Benjamin Franklin was a seditious propagandist; and if Washington had been taken, he would have been sent to Botany Bay. America, I know, will not be false to her own high traditions and to the immortal men who made her history. And I do, indeed, believe that time is coming when America will have to decide, once for all, whether she will be an ally of the tyrants or the people. Who can doubt which? No thinking man now imagines that the present order of things in Europe can be sustained by multiplying bayonets and heaping on taxes forever. The Creator of the world did not, assuredly, kindle the noblest spirits, and crown with intellect the most godlike brows on earth, only that those spirits should consume themselves for ever in vain; that those lofty intellects should be dragged down into idiocy or wrung into insanity forever, into an eternal and hopeless conflict with cureless wrong, and slavery, and falsehood. No, I believe in a moral and intellectual electricity. I believe that nothing, of all the thought and passion expended for this cause, has been lost, but that it is heating, kindling, even now, the atmosphere of the world. I believe that not a solitary captive has sighed forth his soul alone in the dungeons of Naples—not a gallant soldier has fallen with his feet to the foe on the fields of Hungary, or Lombardy, or Baden—not an imprisoned student has grown prematurely bald, or prematurely gray, or has gone mad in the cells of Spielberg, but his spirit lives, and moves about us, helping to swell and kindle the leavening, heaving, seething mass of that fluid which breeds God's earthquakes and his lightnings. Citizens of New York, I thank you; and I have repaid your kindness at least with candour. No secretary or man shall charge me with fraud. I am a professed revolutionist now—an adventurer—a seditious propagandist. I mean to make use of the freedom guaranteed to me as a citizen or inchoate citizen of America, to help and to stimulate the movement of European democracy, and especially of Irish independence. I mean to claim for the revolutionary refugees here not only the hospitality and the comity of America, but also her sympathy and active friendship—nay, I claim for them that America shall be to them the very standing-ground prayed for by Archimedes, whereon they may plant a lever that shall move the world.

PERGOLESI.

[FROM THE GERMAN OF GNIBEL.]

Now at last his work he endeth,
And the pious Master sendeth
Grateful thanks to Heaven's throne,
Then break forth in glorious pealing,
Through the Temple's lofty ceiling,
Holy hymn and organ tone!

Stabat mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lacrymosa,
Dum pendebat filius,
Cujus animam gementem
Contristatam ac dolentem
Pertransivit gladius.

And the virgin mother's anguish
Makes each heart with sorrow languish,
While the organ louder swells;
Till in music's heavenly tide
Grief itself is satisfied,
And the tear of pity wells.

Quis est homo, qui non fleret,
Christi matrem si videret
In tanto supplicio,
Quis non posset contristari
Piam matrem contemplari
Dolentem cum filio.

Holy fear and earnest longing
O'er the Master's soul come thronging,
Preluding that death is nigh;
Then with faith ecstatic burning,
See him to the altar turning,
To the Virgin throned high.

Virgo virginum præclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara,
Fac me tecum plangere;
Fac ut portem Christi mortem
Passionis ego sortem
Et plagas recolere.

Hark! seraphic voices singing!
From the heavenly regions bringing
Wondrous music down to men!
Holy spirits earthward fly,
Bear the Master's soul on high,
And the song ascends again.

Fac me cruce custodiri,
Morte Christi præmuniri,
Confoveri gratia;
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animæ donetur
Pardisi gloria.

—*Literary World.* W. W. C.

W. W. BROWN'S NEW WORK.*

From The (London) Eastern Star.

AMERICA would soon cease to be a slaveholding country if she gave birth to many such men as Wm. Wells Brown. We should hear no more of those insurmountable obstacles to the cause of Abolition which are now said to exist. We should hear nothing of the dangers to America which would arise from a complete emancipation of her slave. We should hear nothing of the *right* which one man has to keep his fellow man in hopeless servitude—in cruel debasing bondage. On the contrary, we should find that the instincts of self-preservation alone would impel every slave-owner to give a practical proof of his belief in the equality of the human race. He would no longer dare to look down upon those whose skin was darker than his own; he would no longer plead that as an apology for crimes more horrible than any that have ever stained the page of world-history; cowardice would give him wisdom; terror would teach him truth. Truth which he denied to justice he would give to fear. He would tread no more upon the worm when he found that it had the power to turn and sting him. Ministers of the Gospel would not either, as at present, degrade their holy calling, and blaspheme God's word, by defending the relations of master and slave. They would read the Holy Word in another spirit, and give different interpretation to that which they now labour so industriously to pervert and falsify. Wm. Wells Brown is no ordinary man. Born and bred a slave, exposed to all the oppression and cruelty which fall to the lot of his race—bought, sold, and bartered as a chattel—torn from those near and dear to him, without hope of meeting again in this world—tasked as a beast of burden, and treated with even less consideration, he has nobly asserted his claim to be recognised as a member of the great human family. He has flung aside the fetters which cruelty had placed upon his limbs, and the still stronger fetters with which ignorance had imprisoned his mind, and he now stands erect, independent, a free man among freemen, earning an honourable subsistence by his talents and his industry. If every slave possessed the determination, energy, boldness, and perseverance which distinguish William Wells Brown, the labours of the Abolitionist might cease at once. No despotism could constrain, no tyranny could bind, no cruelty could subdue the spirit of resistance which would be aroused. Emancipation would be granted not as being likely to lead to the disruption of society, to the extinction of trade, and to the confiscation of property, but as the only means by which these and even deeper evils could be avoided. Slavery, we repeat, would cease for ever.

The book before us appears to have been written for the purpose of proving—if any additional proof were needed—that the incidents which the authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" has related in that admirable work are no mere inventions of fancy, but actual occurrences, the counterparts of which are to be met with in the daily scenes of slave life. The author has imagined, perhaps, and we think with justice, a book written by one who has himself tasted of the horrors he describes, by one who has taken part in the ghastly scenes which he delineates, would be more convincing than any vindication, any appeal to facts, any arguments put forth by those who are necessarily compelled to receive their information from others. Accordingly, "Clotel" is a reproduction of many of the events in the author's life, bound together by the lightest possible thread of fiction, more for the purpose of giving a connected form to the narrative than of investing it with the interest of imaginative incident. Those, therefore, who expect to find in its pages the thrilling power, the easy humour, or the graphic description of Mrs. Stowe, will be disappointed. But to all who may still entertain doubts as to the truthfulness of the pictures of slave life which that authoress has drawn; to all who may wish to accumulate evidence of the capacity of the human mind, even under the worst circumstances, to elevate itself above the influences which tend to darken and debase it; to all who wish freedom to the captive negro, and who hail with delight any fresh evidence of his power to appreciate and to obtain it, "Clotel" will be welcomed as a remarkable and an interesting book. Mr. Brown writes with ease and fluency; he does not pretend to possess those finished graces of style which belong to the writers of fiction; but he expresses himself in a clear, intelligible, manly manner, oftentimes writing with considerable force, when more than ordinarily aroused by the recollection of his wrongs and the wrongs of his race. There is a dash, too, of humour in many parts of the work which we could scarcely have expected from one who has suffered so much, and which relieves the more painful portions of the narrative. The following extracts afford fair evidence of the author's style and powers. We cordially recommend "Clotel" to all our readers:

"STEAMBOAT GAMBLING ON THE MISSISIPPI.

"Thousands of dollars change hands during a passage from Louisville or St. Louis to New Orleans on a Mississippi steamer, and many men, and even ladies, are completely ruined. "Go, call my boy, steward," said Mr. Smith, as he took his cards one by one from the table. In a few moments, a fine-looking, bright-eyed, mulatto boy, apparently about fifteen years of age, was standing by his master's side at the table. "What price do you set on that boy?" asked Johnson, as he took a roll of bills from his pocket. "He will bring a thousand dollars any day in the New Orleans market," replied Smith. "Then you bet the whole of the boy, do you?" "Yes." "I call you, then," said Johnson, at the same time spreading his cards out upon the table. "You have beat me," said Smith, as soon as he saw the cards. Jerry, who was standing on the top of the table with the bank notes and silver dollars round his feet, was now ordered to descend from the table. "You will not forget that you belong to me," said Johnson, as the young slave was stepping from the table to a chair. "No, sir," replied the chattel. "Now, go back to your bed, and be up in time to-morrow morning to brush my clothes, and to clean my boots, do you hear?" "Yes, sir," replied Jerry, as he wiped the tears from his eyes. Such is the uncertainty of a slave's position. He goes to bed at night the property of the man with whom he has lived for years, and gets up in the morning the slave of some one he has never seen before! To behold five or six tables in a steamboat's cabin, with half a dozen men playing at cards and money, bowie-knives, &c., all in confusion on the tables, is what may be seen at almost any time on the Mississippi river. * * * * On the arrival of the boat at Baton Rouge, an additional number of passengers were taken on board; and amongst them several persons who had been attending the races. Gambling and drinking were now the order of the day. Just as the ladies and gentlemen were assembling at the supper-table, the report of a pistol was heard in the direction of the Social Hall, which caused great uneasiness to the ladies, and took the gentleman to that part of the cabin. However, nothing serious had occurred. A man at one of the tables where they were gambling had been seen attempting to conceal a card in his sleeve, and one of the party seized his pistol and fired; but fortunately the barrel of the pistol was knocked up just as it was about to be discharged, and the ball passed through the upper deck instead of the man's head, as was intended. Order was soon restored; all went on well the remainder of the night, and the next day, at ten o'clock, the boat arrived at New Orleans, and the passengers went to the hotels, and the slaves to the market."

A SLAVE BURNT TO DEATH.

"A mob was collected together, and a Lynch Court was held to determine what was best to be done with the negro who had had the impudence to raise his hand against a white man. The Lynch Court decided that the negro should be burnt at the stake. A Natchez paper, the *Free Trader*, giving an account of it, says, the body was taken and chained to a tree immediately on the banks of the Mississippi, on what is called Union Point. Faggots were then collected and piled around him, to which he appeared quite indifferent. When the work was completed, he was asked what he had to say. He then warned all to take example by him, and asked the prayers of all around; he then called for a drink of water, which was handed to him; he drank it, and said—'Now set fire, I am ready to go in peace.' The torches were lighted, and placed in the pile, which soon ignited. He watched unmoved the curling flame that grew until it began to entwine itself around and fix upon his body; then he sent forth cries of agony, painful to the ear, begging some one to blow his brains out; at the same time surging with almost superhuman strength until the staple with which the chain was fastened to the tree (not being well secured) drew out, and he leaped from the burning pile. At that moment the sharp ringing of several rifles was heard; the body of the negro fell a corpse on the ground. He was picked up by some two or three, and again thrown into the fire and consumed, not a vestige remaining to show that such a being ever existed. Nearly four thousand slaves were collected from the plantations in the neighbourhood to witness this scene. Numerous speeches were made by the magistrates and ministers of religion to the large concourse of slaves, warning them, and telling them that the same fate awaited them if they should prove rebellious to their owners."

AN OLD NEW YEAR'S POEM.

THE London *Notes and Queries* gives the following antique poem from the fly-leaf of an old book. It is not only appropriate to the month, but a gem of its kind:

"Though I bee poore, yet will I make hard shift
But I will send my God a new yeares gift.
Nor myrrhe nor frankincense
Can I dispense,
Nor gold of Ophir
Is in my cofer:
With wealth I haue so small acquaintance as
I scarce know tinne from siluer, gold from brasse.

"Oriental rubyes, emeralds greene,
Blew saphires, sparkling diamonds I haue seene,
Yet neuer yet did touch
Or gemme or ouche,
Nor pearle nor amber
Are in my chamber;
These things are in my mind, but neuer yet
Vouchsaf'd to lodge within my cabinet.

"My euer liuing, euer louing King
Yet shall from me receiue a better thing;
For princes diademes,
Flaming with gemmes,
With richesse drest
Of east and west,
Match not this gift, wch if my God shall owne,
I'll not change lots with him that weares a crowne.

"An heart with penitence ma de new and cleane,
Fill'd with faith, hope, and loue, must be my strene.
My God, yt didst not slight
The widowes mite,
Accept of this
Poore sacrifice,
Though I nere give but what before was Thine
A treasure taken out of Thine owne mine."

AMERICAN AUTHORSHIP.

OF all the American authors those of school-books excepted, there is no one of whose books so many have been circulated as those of Mr. Irving. Prior to the publication of the edition recently issued by Putnam, the sale had amounted to some hundreds of thousands; and yet of that edition, selling at $1 25 per volume, it has already amounted to 144,000 vols. Of *Uncle Tom*, the sale has amounted to 295,000 copies, partly in one and partly in two vols., and the total number of volumes amounts, probably, to about 450,000.

	Price per vol.	Vols.
Of the two works of Miss Warner, Queechy, and the Wide, Wide World, the price and sale have been	$ 88	104,000
Fern Leaves, by Fanny Fern, in six months,	1 25	45,000
Reveries of a Bachelor, and other books, by Ike Marvel	1 25	70,000
Alderbrook, by Fanny Forester, 3 vols.	50	33,000
Northup's Twelve Years a Slave	1 00	20,000
Novels of Mrs. Hentz, in 3 years	63	93,000
Major Jones's Courtship and Travels	50	31,000
Salad for the Solitary, by a new author, in 5 months	1 25	5,000
Headley's Napoleon and his Marshals, Washington and his Generals, and other works,	1 25	200,000
Stephens's Travels in Egypt and Greece	87	80,000
Stephens's Travels in Yucatan and Central America	2 50	60,000
Kendall's Expedition to Santa Fe	1 25	40,000
Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea, 8vo.	3 00	15,000
Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea, 12mo.	1 25	8,000
Western Scenes	2 50	14,000
Young's Science of Government	1 00	12,000
Seward's Life of John Quincy Adams	1 00	30,000
Frost's Pictorial History of the World, 2vols.	2 50	60,000
Sparks's American Biography, 25 vols.	75	100,000
Encyclopædia Americana, 14 vols	2 00	280,000
Griswold's Poets and Prose Writers of America, 3 vols	75	300,000
Aiken's Christian Minstrel, in two years	62	40,000
Alexander on the Psalms, 3 vols.	1 17	10,000
Buist's Flower Garden Directory	1 25	10,000
Cole on Fruit Trees	50	18,000
Cole on Diseases of Domestic Animals	50	34,000
Downing's Fruit and Fruit Trees	1 50	15,000
Downing's Rural Essays	3 50	3,000
Downing's Landscape Gardening	3 50	9,000
Downing's Cottage Residences	2 00	6,250
Downing's Country Homes	4 00	3,500
Mahan's Civil Engineering	3 00	7,500
Leslie's Cookery and Receipt Books	1 00	96,000
Guyot's Lectures on Earth and Man	1 00	6,000
Wood and Bache's Medical Dispensatory	5 00	60,000
Duglison's Medical Writings, in all 10 vols.	2 50	50,000
Pancoast's Surgery, 4to	10 00	4,000
Rayer, Ricord, and Moreau's Surgical Works (translations)	15 00	5,500
Webster's Works 6 vols	2 00	46,800
Kent's Commentaries 4 vols	3 38	84,000

Next to Chancellor Kent's work comes Greenleaf on Evidence, 3, vols., $16 50; the sale of which has been exceedingly great, but what has been its extent, I cannot say.

Of Blatchford's General Statutes of New York, a local work, price $4 50, the sale has been 3,000; equal to almost 30,000 of a similar work for the United Kingdom.

How great is the sale of Judge Story's books can be judged only from the fact that the copy-right now yields, and for years past has yielded, more than $8,000 per annum. Of the sale of Mr. Prescott's works little is certainly known, but it cannot, I understand, have been less than 160,000 volumes. That of Mr. Bancroft's History has already risen, certainly to 30,000 copies, and I am told it is considerably more; and yet even that is a sale, for such a work, entirely unprecedented.

Of the works of Hawthorne, Longfellow, Bryant, Willis, Curtis, Sedgwick, Sigourney, and numerous others, the sale is exceedingly great; but, as not even an approximation to the true amount can be offered, I must leave it to you to judge of it by comparison with those of less popular authors above enumerated. In several of these cases, beautifully illustrated editions have been published, of which large numbers have been sold. Of Mr. Longfellow's volume there have been no less than ten editions. These various facts will probably suffice to satisfy you that this country presents a market for books of almost every description, unparalleled in the world.

* * * * *

I have now before me a statement from a single publisher, in which he says that to Messrs. Willis, Longfellow, Bryant, and Alston, his price was uniformly $50 for a poetical article, long or short—and his readers know that they were generally very short; in one case only fourteen lines. To numerous others it was from $25 to $40. In one case he has paid $25 per page for prose. To Mr. Cooper he paid $1,800 for a novel, and $1,000 for a series of naval biographies, the author retaining the copy-right for separate publication; and in such cases, if the work be good, its appearance in the magazine acts as the best of advertisements. To Mr. James he paid $1,200 for a novel, leaving him also the copy-right. For a single number of his journal he has paid to authors $1,500. The total amount paid for original matter by two magazines—the selling price of which is $3 per annum—in ten years, has exceeded $130,000, giving an average of $13,000 per annum. The Messrs. Harper inform me that the expenditure for literary and artistic labour required for their magazine is $2,000 per month, or $24,000 a year.

Passing upward, we reach the producers of books, and here we find rewards not, I believe, to be paralleled elsewhere. Mr. Irving stands, I imagine, at the head of living authors for the amount received for his books. The sums paid to the renowned Peter Parley must have been enormously great, but what has been their extent I have no means of ascertaining. Mr. Mitchell, the geographer, has realized a handsome fortune from his school-books. Professor Davies is understood to have received more than $50,000 from the series published by him. The Abbotts, Emerson, and numerous other authors engaged in the preparation of books for young persons and schools, are largely paid, Prof. Anthon, we are informed, has received more than $60,000 for his series of classics. The French series of Mr. Bolmar has yielded him upward of $20,000. The school geography of Mr. Morse is stated to have yielded more than $20,000 to the author. A single medical book, of one 8vo. volume, is understood to have produced its authors $60,000, and a series of medical books has given to its author probably $30,000. Mr. Downing's receipts from his books have been very large. The two works of Miss Warner must have already yielded her from $12,000 to 15,000, and perhaps much more. Mr. Headley is stated to have received about $40,000; and the few books of Ike Marvel have yielded him about $20,000; a single one, *The Reveries of a Batchelor*, produced more than $4000 in the first six months. Mrs. Stowe has been very largely paid. Miss Leslie's Cookery and Receipt books have paid her $12,000. Dr. Barnes is stated to have received more than $30,000 for the copyright of his religious works. Fanny Fern has probably received not less than $6,000 for the 12mo. volume published but six months since. Mr. Prescott was stated, several years since, to have then received $90,000 from his books, and I have never seen it contradicted. According to the rate of compensation generally understood to be received by Mr. Bancroft, the present sale of each volume of his yields him more than $15,000, and he has the long period of forty-two years for future sale. Judge Story died, as has been stated, in the receipt of more than $8,000 per annum; and the amount has not, as it is understood, diminished. Mr. Webster's works, in three years, can scarcely have paid less than $25,000. Kent's Commentaries are understood to have yielded to the author and his heirs more than $120,000, and if we add to this for the remainder of the period only one half of this sum, we shall obtain $180,000, or $45,000 as the compensation for a single 8vo. volume, a reward for literary labour unexampled in history. What has been the amount received by Professor Greenleaf I cannot learn, but his work stands second only, in the legal line, to that of Chancellor Kent. The price paid for Webster's 8vo. Dictionary is understood to be fifty cents per copy; and if so, with a sale of 250 000, it must already have reached $125,000. If now to this we add the quarto, at only a dollar a copy, we shall have a sum approaching to, and perhaps exceeding, $180,000; more, probably, than has been paid for all the dictionaries of Europe in the same period of time. What have been the prices paid to Messrs. Hawthorne, Longfellow, Byrant, Willis, Curtis, and numerous others, I cannot say; but it is well known that they have been very large. It is not, however, only the few who are liberally paid; all are so who manifest any ability, and here it is that we find the effect of the decentralizing system of this country as compared with the centralizing one of Great Britain. There Mr. Macauley is largely paid for his Essays, while men of almost equal ability can scarcely obtain the means of support. Dickens is a literary Crœsus, and Tom Hood dies leaving his family in hopeless poverty. Such is not here the case. Any manifestation of ability is sure to produce claimants for the publication of books. No sooner had the story of "Hot Corn" appeared in the *Tribune*, than a dozen booksellers were applicants to the author for a book. The competition is here for the *purchase* of the privilege of printing, and this competition is not confined to the publishers of a single city, as is the case in Britain. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and even Auburn and Cincinnati, present numerous publishers, all anxious to secure the works of writers of ability, in any department of literature; and were it possible to present a complete list of our well-paid authors, its extent could not fail to surprise you greatly, as the very few facts that have come to my knowledge in reference to some of the lesser of the literary world have done by me. You will observe that I have confined myself to the question of demand for books and compensation to their authors, without reference to that of the ability displayed in their preparation. That we may have good books, all that is required is that we make a large market for them, which is done here to an extent elsewhere unknown.—*From H. C. Cary's Letters on International Copyright.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

A naval action has been fought upon the coast of Asia Minor, ending in the total destruction of a portion of the Ottoman fleet.

——HEATHENISM IN LONDON.—I have been comparing notes between the condition of the heathen of London and the heathen of India; and I am compelled to say that, contrasted with the outrages and wild orgies of Indian heathenism, there are lamentable proofs that heathenism is actually surpassed in wickedness by the metropolis of England.—*Rev. Dr. Duff.*

——A CROW-BAR.—In "Johnson's Dictionary" the explanation given of this word is "piece of iron used as a lever to force open doors, as the Latins called a hook *corvus*." In Walters' "English and Welsh Dictionary," the first part of which was published about the year 1770, this word is printed "*Croe*-bar." Is it probable that the word *crow* has been derived from the Camb.-Brit. word *cro*, a curve? and that the name has been given from the circumstance of one end of a crow-bar being curved for the purpose of making it more efficient as a lever?—N. W. S.—*Notes and Queries.*

——The following conversation is stated by a Portsmouth contemporary to have actually taken place not many days ago between a burgess and a candidate for the town council: "Candidate. Well, I suppose I shall have your support this time, as usual?—Burgess: No, you cannot have my support.—Candidate: Why?—Burgess: Because you are going in opposition to the Almighty. Candidate (astonished): In opposition to the Almighty! In what respect?—Burgess: God is about to visit us with a judgment. He is going to visit us with the cholera, and you set yourself up to prevent God from executing that judgment by endeavouring to introduce the Health of Towns Act. The candidate tried to convince him of the absurdity of the blind fatalism of which he was possessed, but without avail."

——A gentleman, well qualified [says the *London Inquirer*] to pronounce an opinion on a question of the kind, who has just returned from a tour of inspection in the United States, has declared that in some of the mills now in operation in that country there are workmen who, on account of their superior intelligence, skill and knowledge of the principles involved in their labours, and having perhaps the advantage of superior machines, are enabled to produce four times as many goods as many ordinary workmen employed in a similar manner in England. One consequence of his statement has been, that a deputation of competent persons is on the point of being sent from this country to investigate the condition of the manufactories in the United States—principally with reference to the education of the workmen.

——WOOD OF THE CROSS.—I find in your 179th No., p. 384, a communication on "The Wood of the Cross." Mention is made of the several kinds of which the cross is said to have been made—elder, olive, &c. It is a somewhat curious coincidence, that yesterday I was with a farmer in his garden, and, observing on several apple trees some luxuriant mistletoe, I remarked that it was principally found on that tree, sometimes on the oak, but rarely on other trees. The farmer, after inquiring whether it could not be propagated by cuttings, &c., asked if ever I understood that our Saviour's cross was made of mistletoe? On replying in the negative, and remarking that it was altogether unsuitable for such a purpose, he rejoined, that previously to that event, it was a large and strong tree, but subsequently had been doomed to have only a parasitical (not that he used the term) existence. Did any one else ever hear of this tradition?—*Notes and Queries.*

——PADDY AND HIS PIG.—Ireland is the paradise of pigs, where if he, who but too often forms the sole wealth of the cotter—he who, in common parlance, "pays the rint"—be not supplied with every luxury that the heart of pig can wish, he at least shares the best of those enjoyed by the family; and repays the kind attentions by a faithful and affectionate attachment to all its members, familiarly rubbing his sides against the knees of his master, basking beside the babies in the sunlight at the cabin door, or nestling with them on the flickering hearthstone, entertaining himself the while like Tennyson's sow—

"With meditative grunts of much content."

A friend of ours, having been previously made acquainted with the fact, paid a visit to a neighbouring cottage, after the hours of work were over, and there, as he expected, found the master of the house walking briskly up and down in the rays of the setting s